

8396. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petition of Effie Mallory and 108 other citizens of Admire, Kans., on behalf of House bill 8264; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8397. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the New Jersey Department, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, urging that an adequate defense, sufficient to resist all possible invasion from foreign countries, be maintained, and asking support of the President's program of preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8398. By Mr. SWEENEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Cuyahoga County, State of Ohio, urging enactment of House bills 7646 and 3649, and hearings by the Post Office and Post Roads Committee; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8399. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, Local 1421, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a bill to deport Harry Bridges; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8400. Also, petition of District No. 2, United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

8401. Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, American Federation of Labor, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the omnibus transportation bill of Senators WHEELER and LEA; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8402. Also, petition of Chevy Local No. 668, United Automobile Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Saginaw, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8403. Also, petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Local 85, Racine, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8404. Also, petition of the International Workers Order, Branch 3506, Calumet City, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the antialien bills, to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8405. Also, petition of the Pullman Porters and Maids Protective Association, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 9406, concerning the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8406. Also, petition of the Railroad News, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 9406, concerning the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8407. Also, petition of the Washington Industrial Union Council, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8408. Also, petition of the Young People's Religious Union, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 7534, concerning the poll-tax restrictions in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8409. Also, petition of the Young People's Religious Union, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Federal antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8410. Also, petition of the Young Women's Christian Association, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antialien bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8411. Also, petition of the International Union, Dodge Local No. 3, United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antialien bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8412. Also, petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Dodge Local No. 3, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8413. Also, petition of Martin J. Gillen, of Land O'Lakes, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the disastrous effect on a financial break-down of our railway systems in relation to our national defense; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 24, 1940

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 24, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Zeb Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art ever nigh, unto whom Thy children flee for succor, we humbly beseech Thee for all sorts and conditions of men, that Thou wouldst be pleased to make Thy ways known unto them, Thy saving health unto all nations.

For the youth of our country we implore Thy guidance and direction, and, as they enter the opening doors of opportunity, eager for the challenging experiences of life, do Thou set for them great tasks, giving them of Thy strength, that, as citizens of our Republic, they may reach the goal of high achievement.

Again we pray for those who have tried and failed, to whom the meridian of life brings naught but discouragement. Do Thou take their broken lives into Thy mending hands, and give them the rehabilitation and comfort of Thy beneficence.

And so, dear Lord, we commit ourselves and our sin-stained world to Thy tender care. Grant that holiness and purity, truth and patience, daring and tenderness, hope and faith may once more be enshrined in the hearts and lives of men as the constant and pervading things in our humanity, as veritable harbingers of peace.

We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, May 23, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calhoun, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 544) making appropriations for work relief and relief, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 255. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the port of Cascade Locks, Oreg., certain lands for municipal purposes; and

S. 1214. An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Andrews	Danaher	King	Reynolds
Ashurst	Davis	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Barbour	Ellender	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gerry	McCarran	Slatery
Bone	Gibson	McKellar	Smathers
Bridges	Gillette	McNary	Smith
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Stewart
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Burke	Hale	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Pepper	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] is absent from the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is engaged in the war maneuvers at Camp Beauregard in Louisiana.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent on official business for the Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ARMY PROMOTION SYSTEM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9243) to provide for the promotion of promotion-list officers of the Army after specified years of service in grade, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. MINTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

MEMORIAL

Mr. WALSH presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Dedham, Mass., remonstrating against the shipment of war materials and supplies to Japan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7543) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept real estate granted to the United States by the city of Miami, Fla., and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1672) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9140) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire land at Key West, Fla., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1675) thereon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 2915) relating to rentals in certain oil and gas leases issued under authority of the act of February 25, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1673) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8403) to convey certain lands to the State of Wyoming, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1674) thereon.

DEFENSE COORDINATION OF THE PANAMA AND FLORIDA CANALS (S. DOC. NO. 198)

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Printing, reported a preliminary study or statement on the defense coordination of the Panama and Florida Canals, by Henry Holland Buckman, a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, referred to that committee on the 30th ultimo with a view to its being printed; and, on motion by Mr. HAYDEN, the statement was ordered to be printed as a document, with illustrations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. BRIDGES introduced Senate bill 4038, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. ASHURST, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. PITTMAN, and Mr. MCCARRAN):

S. 4039. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate and to put into effect charges for electrical energy generated at Boulder Dam, providing for the application of revenues from said project, authorizing the operation of the Boulder Power Plant by the United States directly or through agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 4040. A bill for the relief of Samuel M. Lipton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 4041. A bill to establish a division of aviation education in the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 4042. A bill to provide for the acquisition of flowage rights and the payment of certain damages in connection with the operation of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. LEE introduced Senate bill 4043, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONEY (for himself and Mr. MEAD):

S. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution for the relief of the distressed and starving men, women, and children of Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Finland, and other similarly afflicted areas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BYRNES:

S. J. Res. 262. Joint resolution providing that Reorganization Plans Nos. III and IV shall take effect on June 30, 1940; to the Select Committee on Government Organization.

(Mr. PEPPER introduced S. J. Res. 263, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and appears under a separate heading.)

PROHIBITION OF USE OF ARMS BY ALIENS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill entitled "A bill to restrict the use of arms and other implements of war by aliens."

Mr. President, the Bill of Rights declares that—

The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

And that—

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated—

And so forth. These rights of the people were intended to be the rights of the citizens of the United States, and possibly of those who have come here and declared their intention of becoming citizens. Certainly, they are rights that no person of mature judgment would now say should be extended to aliens. If we are to allow 1 alien to keep and bear arms in the United States, inferentially we must allow 2 aliens to do the same thing. Carrying the proposition to its logical conclusion, if we allow 2 aliens to arm, then why not 4? If we allow 4 aliens to arm, why not 16? If 16, why not 256? If 256, why not an entire Army corps?

There can only be one answer to this proposition, and that is that no alien must be allowed to keep and bear arms or other implements of war in the United States.

For several days we have been discussing civil liberties; but I know of no reason why an alien, a guest of our country, should be extended any opportunity to become affiliated with any organization or engage in any "fifth column" activities in this country.

Section 41, chapter 3, title 8 of the United States Code of Laws, an enactment of Congress, provides for equal rights under the law for all persons. This is a privilege that has been miserably misused in the past by aliens, gangsters, racketeers, and political disruptionists.

Mr. President, I believe the time has come when we should halt the advance of the "fifth column" in America. Therefore I am today introducing a bill which I commend to your attention. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 4038) to restrict the use of arms and other implements of war by aliens was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

PROGRAMS OF ADULT CIVIC EDUCATION

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill for proper reference, and that in connection therewith a statement by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 4043) to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in establishing and developing programs in adult civic education providing for (a) removal of illiteracy, (b) naturalization education, and (c) public-affairs forums during a 3-year period was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The statement presented by Mr. LEE in connection with the bill is as follows:

Apportionment of \$10,000,000 for Senate bill S. 2151 (76th Cong., 1st sess.)

[Bureau of Education]

States and Territories	Population, 21 years of age and over, 1930	Percent of total, 21 years of age and over, in States receiving more than \$30,000 minimum	Apportionment
Alabama	1,348,401	1.85144257	\$177,553.34
Arizona	244,115	1.33518583	32,144.32
Arkansas	968,231	1.32944435	127,493.71
California	3,864,388	5.30605691	508,830.86
Colorado	623,523	1.85613777	82,103.61
Connecticut	985,782	1.35354302	129,804.78
Delaware	(148,792)		(30,000.00)
District of Columbia	341,465	1.46885373	44,963.07
Florida	866,198	1.18934638	114,058.32
Georgia	1,498,567	2.05763029	197,326.75
Idaho	246,770	1.33883131	32,493.92
Illinois	4,841,768	6.64806344	637,549.29
Indiana	2,003,019	2.75027580	263,751.45
Iowa	1,506,129	2.06801341	198,322.49
Kansas	1,130,224	1.55187131	148,824.46
Kentucky	1,422,434	1.95309471	187,301.78
Louisiana	1,134,852	1.55822586	149,433.86
Maine	487,125	1.66885441	64,143.14

Apportionment of \$10,000,000 for Senate bill S. 2151 (76th Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

States and Territories	Population, 21 years of age and over, 1930	Percent of total, 21 years of age and over, in States receiving more than \$30,000 minimum	Apportionment
Maryland	996,928	1.36884720	\$131,272.45
Massachusetts	2,686,487	3.68872197	353,748.44
Michigan	2,939,409	4.03600038	387,052.44
Minnesota	1,537,983	2.11175103	202,516.92
Mississippi	1,031,547	1.41638135	135,830.97
Missouri	2,269,657	3.11638718	298,861.53
Montana	318,611	1.43747370	41,953.73
Nebraska	812,450	1.11554687	106,980.95
Nevada	(60,794)		(30,000.00)
New Hampshire	294,055	1.40375671	38,720.27
New Jersey	2,512,112	3.44920372	330,787.27
New Mexico	(216,956)		(30,000.00)
New York	8,142,851	11.18066583	1,072,225.85
North Carolina	1,542,125	2.11743826	203,062.33
North Dakota	358,182	1.49180726	47,164.32
Ohio	4,132,251	5.67385029	544,122.24
Oklahoma	1,287,131	1.76731486	169,485.50
Oregon	621,375	1.85318843	81,820.77
Pennsylvania	5,656,779	7.76712673	744,867.45
Rhode Island	421,197	1.57833097	55,461.94
South Carolina	819,384	1.12506770	107,893.99
South Dakota	385,808	1.52973956	50,802.02
Tennessee	1,418,144	1.94720426	186,736.89
Texas	3,220,880	4.42247843	424,115.68
Utah	264,498	1.36317302	34,828.29
Vermont	(220,428)		(30,000.00)
Virginia	1,300,893	1.78621099	171,297.64
Washington	1,010,167	1.38702521	133,015.72
West Virginia	909,987	1.23711395	118,639.23
Wisconsin	1,768,818	2.42870255	232,912.58
Wyoming	(132,954)		(30,000.00)
United States, outlying possessions:			
Alaska	(36,074)		(30,000.00)
Hawaii	(192,802)		(30,000.00)
Puerto Rico	666,050	1.91453012	87,703.44
Total	72,829,750 (1,008,800)	100.00000000 (99.99999963)	9,590,000.00 (210,000.00)
Administration			200,000.00
Total			10,000,000.00

AID SHORT OF WAR TO CERTAIN FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on Tuesday I introduced a joint resolution authorizing the President, who would have acted, of course, only upon the advice of his military and naval aides, to have sold and delivered for cash to the Allies and other nations who are resisting unprovoked aggression, certain airplanes and fighting equipment for cash and at a fair price to be fixed by the President.

The President was authorized to replace such equipment if, as, and when he might deem it necessary to do so, from any such equipment which is being manufactured for such nations in this country.

Those nations that are fighting for their very lives and for civilization in Europe would have gotten some effective help at once when they needed it so badly. We would have traded in substance old planes which are daily becoming out of date for the newest planes at the President's discretion.

I felt that the American people did not want to sit by in this crucial time without doing what they could do short of war to let those fighting this terrible battle know that we wanted to help and we were helping.

I felt that such action from this country would stimulate the morale of the Allies, would be a warning to Mussolini which might keep him out of this war.

It was amazing to me to find that this joint resolution extending this limited aid to those fighting with their backs to the wall from the most flagrant violations of international law by Hitler was objected to and tabled by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee without any report from the State Department within a few hours after it had been received by the committee and on the ground that it would be a violation of international law.

To those who say that such help, which would be immediate and practical on our part, would be in violation of international law, I reply with certain facts that are so ugly that it is almost impossible for some of our legalistic minds to conceive of, that is, so far as Europe is concerned, there is no

international law; so far as Europe is concerned, law is dead. Hitler has murdered law along with everything else.

The civilized world will not hear Hitler claim the protection of international law against decent countries that are lending aid short of war to the victims of his unprovoked aggression in violation of every sentiment of decency and international law.

For the duration of his power, international law has been suspended in Europe and in relations with Europe, and it never will be reinstated unless his ruthless aggressions are stopped.

So much for the common sense of it. That every clear-minded plain citizen not befogged by the word-mindedness of lawyers sees as clear as the nose on his face.

But for those who have to think like lawyers before they can think like human beings, let me call their attention to this:

Germany has not only violated the rules of international law but she has violated a solemn treaty to which the United States is a party. That is the Kellogg Pact, under which Germany agreed with us and other nations not to use war as an instrument of national policy.

We have a very definite responsibility to those who have taken up arms in defense of the Kellogg Peace Pact. Germany's flouting of the Kellogg Peace Pact and her unprovoked invasion of neutral territory are factors which have been overlooked and ignored by those who opposed my original resolution.

I have therefore redrafted my resolution so as to make clear that our action in selling planes, ships, and artillery pieces to the Allies is not the action of an intermeddling neutral but legal action short of war, fully justified and morally demanded by reason of Germany's flouting of our treaty rights.

Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce the joint resolution for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution of the Senator from Florida will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 263) authorizing limited aid short of war to foreign governments resisting the unprovoked military aggression of Germany was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 544) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE ON TWO LOAN BILLS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs to move that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bills (S. 4008) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for the development of deposits of strategic and critical minerals and other metallic and nonmetallic minerals, and to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make more adequate loans for mineral developmental purposes, and (S. 4013) providing for small loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to facilitate the preliminary development and production of strategic, critical, and other metallic and nonmetallic minerals, both bills relating to the making of loans, and that they be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment proposing to amend section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 544) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted an amendment proposing to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, intended to

be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 544) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ELIMINATION OF OPPRESSIVE LABOR PRACTICES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. REYNOLDS proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1970) to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. ADAMS and Mr. BARKLEY each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the amendment proposed today by Mr. REYNOLDS to the bill (S. 1970) to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BROWN submitted five amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1970) to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF THE JUDICIAL CODE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7737) to amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section thereto, designated as section 266a, to provide for intervention by States in certain cases involving the validity of the exercise of any power by the United States, or any agency thereof, or any officer or employee thereof, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the language stricken out by the said amendment, and on page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "the exercise of any power" and insert in lieu thereof the words "any power or its exercise"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JNO. E. MILLER,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
ALBERT B. CHANDLER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
HATTON SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
U. S. GUYER,
DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, JR.,
JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

UKRAINIANS IN THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Congress of Ukrainian Organizations in the United States, on Friday, May 24, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

METHODS OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION—ARTICLE BY HUGH S. JOHNSON

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Hugh S. Johnson on methods of public discussion, published in the Washington Daily News of May 8, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

"PERSPECTIVE"—EDITORIAL BY RAYMOND MOLEY

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by Raymond Moley entitled "Perspective," published in Newsweek of May 27, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK SUN ON WAR RESOURCES BOARD

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Sun of May 21, 1940, entitled "The Short, Sad Story of the War Resources Board," which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT BY GRAND RAPIDS PRESS ON COLONEL LINDBERGH'S SPEECH

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Grand Rapids Press entitled "A Voice of Reason," which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY THOMAS H. BECK ON NATIONAL AVIATION FORUM

[Mr. CLARK of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Thomas H. Beck entitled "The National Aviation Forum of 1940," which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY CHARLES HALL DAVIS ON AMERICANISM

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by Charles Hall Davis, of Petersburg, Va., entitled "Americanism Defined," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN WAR—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. LUNDEEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of May 24, 1940, entitled "Hot Heads, Bone Heads, and Cool Heads on the War," which appears in the Appendix.]

IF THE ALLIES LOSE—ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson, published in the Washington Post of May 23, 1940, entitled "If the Allies Lose," which appears in the Appendix.]

ALLIES NEED ARSENAL—ARTICLE BY ERNEST LINDLEY

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Ernest Lindley, published in the Washington Post of May 24, 1940, entitled "Allies Need Arsenal," which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA SEEN FACING NAZI PERIL IF ALLIES ARE DEFEATED IN WAR—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Sunday Star of May 19, 1940, entitled "America Seen Facing Nazi Peril if Allies Are Defeated in War," which appears in the Appendix.]

BACK AGAIN—EDITORIAL FROM FORT MYERS NEWS-PRESS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Fort Myers News-Press of May 16, 1940, entitled "Back Again," which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—LETTERS AND STATEMENTS TO SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain statements and letters addressed to him, with respect to the foreign policy of the United States, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT TEXAS COTTON GINNERS ASSOCIATION CONVENTION

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. James A. Farley at the convention of the Texas Cotton Ginnners' Association, Dallas, Tex., Thursday, April 4, 1940, on the subject Cotton Marches On, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHNNIE GET YOUR GUN—ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

[Mr. LUNDEEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by John T. Flynn, published in the New Republic of May 27, 1940, entitled "Johnnie, Get Your Gun," which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL AVIATION FORUM OF 1940

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Thomas H. Beck, chairman of the National Aviation Forum of 1940, together with the program of the National Aviation Forum for the week of May 26, 1940, which appear in the Appendix.]

ELIMINATION OF OPPRESSIVE LABOR PRACTICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1970) to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] gave notice yesterday that he desired to continue his remarks today. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk amendments intended to be offered to the pending bill. The first amendment proposes to strike out section 9 (a) and (b), page 16, lines 7 to 21, inclusive.

The second amendment would strike out all after the comma in line 11, page 9, down to and including the colon in line 13 and insert a period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF "FIFTH COLUMN" ACTIVITIES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read to the Members of this body by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 272) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a special committee, to consist of three Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, which shall make a full and complete investigation with respect to the activities of the so-called "fifth column" and any other subversive or un-American activities which affect in any manner the national-defense program of the United States. Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-sixth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the pleasure of the Senate as to the disposition of the resolution?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to have it referred to the proper committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, as has doubtless been heard, my resolution interests itself exclusively in an investigation by a body of Senate Members pertaining to what is now known as the "fifth column." As a matter of fact, the employment of the words "fifth column" is of recent usage by the American people as a whole. However, we know that the "fifth column" means not a thing in the world but alien enemies, or, to employ more recent words that came out of Norway and Denmark, Trojan horses.

We have had alien enemies in this country for many years; and many of us have endeavored to impress the American people with the fact that annually thousands upon thousands of alien enemies have been coming to this country legally and illegally, some arriving legally and remaining here illegally; but for some unknown reason—certainly a reason unknown to me—the American people never have been able to convince themselves that there were enemies in their midst. As a result, nothing heretofore has been brought prominently to their attention on this subject through the columns of the press until the present emergency arose. That is indeed extremely unfortunate when we take into consideration the experiences of Great Britain, France, Norway, Denmark, and the low countries of Belgium and Holland. But I say again, Thank Heaven that at last the American people have awakened to the fact that their danger actually is in their midst, and that real, imminent danger does not exist from without.

We are excited, naturally, and perhaps duly, as a result of the successful aggressions recently made in Europe; but I say to you unqualifiedly that, in my opinion, our imminent and great danger is right here with us today in the United States of America.

Our danger now is from the enemy within, in other words, from the Trojan horses, the "fifth column," the alien enemies, and as a result of their profusion in this country, north east, south, and west, I think that one of the finest things this body could possibly do would be to set up an investigating committee to ascertain something about the "fifth column" in this country as it is related exclusively to our national defense, which we are so desirous now of promoting.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We hear a great deal about alien enemies in this country, and the idea that there are many such is unquestionably very well grounded and very well founded; but does not the Senator think that there are a great many native-born American citizens, citizens because they were born in the United States, who are not exactly prime, so far as the question of adherence to American institutions and American ideals is concerned?

In the very recent past we have seen in Norway an example of the so-called "fifth column," not led and manned so much by Germans, as by a former member of the Norwegian cabinet, no less than a former minister of war, who was probably responsible for the sabotage and the unnecessary surrender of the Norwegian defense. While I agree with much the Senator has said as to the alien enemies in our midst, we also should look around from time to time for the native-born enemies in our midst.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am greatly indebted to my distinguished colleague for that observation, because it has likewise been my observation, as well as information derived from various and sundry sources, that there are American-born citizens who unfortunately have associated themselves with organizations which are now causing considerable discussion as the result of their having affiliated themselves with various Communist and Nazi and Fascist groups in this country. As a matter of fact, if my resolution should be adopted, and an appropriation made in accordance with its terms, I believe it would be the duty of the committee to make an investigation of all subversive organizations allied with foreign powers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the case of the distinguished retired major general of the United States Army, a man still drawing retired pay from the United States Army, who has been accused, and not only accused but very convincing proof has been adduced to support the accusation, of being affiliated with an organization prepared to try to overturn the United States Government. I read an article in a newspaper today to the effect that a Representative in the other body had suggested that he knew of a number of colonels in the Army who had very strong Fascist notions. I do not know who the Representative is; I do not know whether or not there is anything at all in that report. I do know that General Moseley has put himself in the attitude of cooperation with fascism in this country, and it seems to me that when we are talking about enemy aliens within our gates we should not overlook such cases as that of General Moseley, who, in my opinion, should have been tried by general court martial, to which a retired officer may still be subjected, when the disclosures about him were made before the Dies committee.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think, as a matter of fact, as I have stated, if my resolution should be adopted and the appropriation made by which the investigation may be conducted, an inquiry into all organizations which have as their objective the weakening or the overthrow of the American Government should be very thoroughly conducted from the standpoint of national defense.

As I stated several days ago, when the opportunity presented itself we should give a vote of thanks to Chairman Dies, of the House committee, and to his able associates; but at this

critical hour and in this emergency, at this time, the first time, as a matter of fact, when we have recognized these unfriendly and un-American elements in this country, there is work for several committees. I know that the Dies committee has been very busily engaged during a period of 2 years past, and I was very glad, indeed, that during the fore part of this session appropriations were made to the extent of \$75,000 for continuing the investigations of that committee into subversive and un-American activities. But, in view of the tremendous amount of publicity which has been given to those subjects and subjects allied thereto, I am firmly of the opinion that there is a place for another committee, a committee of the Senate, as suggested by me in the resolution, and perhaps additional committees, for the very simple and plausible reason that we are making appropriations of billions of dollars for the purpose of providing not only an adequate national defense but a perfect national defense, in order that the American people may feel that they are safe insofar as aggression from any other country in the world is concerned. I hope that my resolution will be passed upon favorably by the committee to which it has been referred and that an appropriation to carry out the objectives of the resolution will be granted.

By the way, in passing I wish to say to the distinguished and able Senator from Missouri, who honors me at this time with his presence, that I hope with all my heart that Congress will see fit to provide him with funds sufficient to carry out the objectives set forth in a resolution recently offered by him and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, a resolution having to do with propaganda in this country, which could, if not stopped, or if not investigated, lead us into untold trouble.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I gladly yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I may say that the resolution was not offered recently, but was presented during the special session which met last fall. It was unanimously reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and has since been before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I have made representations from time to time to the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], for action on the resolution, which, under the Senate rules, had to go to his committee before it could be adopted by the Senate. The Senator from South Carolina assured me that he intended to give consideration to the resolution but insisted on having hearings, and a hearing was set for last Monday. Last Monday, of course, was the day when the Committee on Appropriations was meeting to report the Army appropriation bill, and the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control very properly postponed the meeting of his committee to a day which has not yet been ascertained.

I can say to the Senator from North Carolina that I intend to press as strongly as I can for action by the Committee to Audit and Control at the earliest possible date in support of the resolution, which has been reported favorably already by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am delighted to have that information from my distinguished colleague, and I hope sincerely that money will be provided to carry out the objectives mentioned in the resolution which he offered at the special session of the Congress in 1939.

Mr. President, we hear much about the "fifth column." As I stated a moment ago in the outset of my remarks, the term "fifth column" merely implies alien enemies, or Trojan horses, about which we have heard so much since the conquest of Norway and Denmark. Yet many people in this country do not know what the term "fifth column" means; they are ignorant about it, because we have but recently employed that term. It rather reminds me of a conversation I had this morning with a taxicab driver when I was coming to the Capitol. He inquired whether or not

I had heard a certain program over the radio last night wherein the gentleman in charge, directing inquiries, was asking questions of a number of school teachers who are in Washington on a visit. I said that I had not had an opportunity to listen to the program. He said, "I was amused. The man in charge made inquiry of one of the group as to whether or not she knew anything about the Hatch Act." This man asked, "Is it true that the Hatch Act is an act prohibiting a farmer from placing more than one dozen eggs under a hen?" [Laughter.] She answered, "That is what the Hatch Act is for." [Laughter.]

I merely mention that because there are many people in this country, as we are aware, who do not know what the "fifth column" is, but if one mentions to them enemy aliens, they know exactly what is meant. If we talk to many of them about Trojan horses, they do not know to what we refer; but if we mention to them "alien enemies," they know exactly what we are talking about.

Mr. President, from this morning's Times-Herald I clipped the following article:

"FIFTH COLUMN" GIVEN NAME BY FRANCO GENERAL—UPRISING DURING ATTACK ON MADRID FULFILLED FORECAST

What is the "fifth column"?

This question is being asked by many, although the term has been in wide circulation for several weeks. Here's how it began:

During the civil war in Spain four columns of nationalist troops were advancing from as many directions on Madrid. The commander of the advancing forces was asked a question about the numbers and disposition of his soldiers.

"We have four columns on the march outside the city," he said. "In the city we have a 'fifth column.'"

Inasmuch as soon afterward there was an uprising of hitherto unsuspected nationalist sympathizers in the Spanish capital the term "fifth column" has come to be associated with all subversive and undercover movements.

The general credited with the remark was Gen. Emilio Mola.

That is how the term "fifth column" originated. The article describes that four columns were advancing upon Madrid during the closing days of the revolution, and the "fifth column" was within the city.

Mr. President, the situation which then existed was not greatly different from the situation which exists now in our own Capital with respect to an attack by "fifth columns," alien enemies, Trojan horses. Alien enemies, members of the "fifth column," are coming from across the Atlantic. They are coming to this country also through Pacific ports. They are entering the United States from across the Canadian border; they are coming north across the Rio Grande from the south, and other members of the "fifth column" are already here by the hundreds of thousands. They have been here for years. For the first time in the history of our country we have awakened to the fact that we are surrounded by the enemy, both night and day, day in and day out, week in and week out. Again I say, thank heaven that the American people have awakened to the fact that the real danger with which they are beset and confronted today is the danger of an attack by the enemy from within.

Mr. President, let us see about it. I clipped many items from the newspapers this morning. I wish to comment on some of them. I wish to ask a few questions and to direct them to some of the officials of our Government, as to why they permitted the disgraceful situation which exists today. If in this country we have thousands upon thousands constituting the "fifth column," some persons are responsible; and, if possible, those who are responsible for this disgraceful condition should be called on the carpet to answer why.

I had a good laugh this morning when I read the following headline in the Washington Times-Herald:

Commerce Department probes all foreign-born in ranks.

Do Senators get the point? That is one of the most laughable things I ever heard. Who is to blame? Who had charge of the Commerce Department? Who employed aliens when millions of Americans were out of work?

The American people are demanding to know why aliens were employed under our own American Government when millions of people, God-fearing men and women, looking for

honest employment, rags and tatters upon their backs, no soles upon their shoes, no shelter to protect them from the wintry blasts were walking the streets.

This is the most ridiculous thing, the most laughable thing, I ever heard of in my life—

Commerce Department probes all foreign-born in ranks.

Mr. President, it is high time to purge the ranks of the Commerce Department. What should the officials of that Department have done? I charge that they were derelict in their duty; that they had forgotten about the poor Americans who were out of employment when they employed aliens, not Americans, to transact the business of the American people. Those officials are the ones to blame. Ours is the only country upon the face of the earth which will give employment to foreigners, to aliens, to noncitizens in preference to our own native-born and naturalized citizens. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. If we find ourselves today in this deplorable condition, surrounded by enemies on every hand, encircled by enemies, it is the fault of the officials of the United States Government who employed them rather than employ American citizens.

Let us see what the article says. The headline continues:

Employees of alien origin are being secretly watched in fear of sabotage.

Mr. President, employees of American institutions, including the American Government, are being watched for fear of sabotage. We have to spend the money of the taxpayers of this country to watch aliens, whom American citizens, officials of this Government, have hired for service in the Government, instead of hiring American citizens.

Mr. President, who can defend such action? I think the officials of this Department, who employed aliens rather than American citizens, should be brought before a committee or committees of the Congress to tell the Members thereof why they were more interested in and more sympathetic with the unemployed aliens than they were with native-born and naturalized American citizens; why they were more interested in taking care of the interests of the nationals of foreign countries than they were of nationals of this country, the country which they are supposed to love.

The article in question is by Mr. Edmond Monk, of the reportorial staff of the Times-Herald. It reads:

Activities of every foreign-born person in the Department of Commerce—

My heavens, I can hardly believe my eyes—

Activities of every foreign-born person in the Department of Commerce are being listed in a secret survey begun less than 36 hours ago, it was learned by the Times-Herald last night.

Can you imagine that, Mr. President? Alien enemies, foreigners, noncitizens have been employed in the Department of Commerce, right here in the Capital of our own country. Then the officials who employed them have the gall, the audacity, at this hour to admit that they employed foreigners instead of Americans; and the ridiculous, the revolting, the nauseating thing about their statement is that they have had to hire someone to watch the aliens whom they employed.

How much longer are the American people going to stand for such actions?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree with much the Senator from North Carolina has been saying, but I cannot sit on the floor of the Senate and hear a man's patriotism impugned merely because of the fact that he happens to have been born in a foreign country.

During the War of the Revolution some of the most distinguished soldiers in the American Army were born abroad. Among them were General Von Steuben, General Lafayette, General Pulaski, and General Kosciuszko, who possibly by his engineering genius brought about the great victory at Saratoga, which is denominated one of the greatest battles, one of the decisive battles of all times.

During the Civil War we had in this country as a general in the Union Army the only man who ever had the honor of serving in this body from three different States, Gen. James Shields, who was not born in the United States.

We have had statesmen, we have had soldiers, we have had sailors who were born abroad.

We have a very distinguished Member of this body who happens to sit in front of me at the moment, the very able and distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who was born abroad.

Some of the greatest contributions to our national development have been made by men who were not so fortunate as to be born in this country. We had Carl Schurz. We had Judah P. Benjamin. We have had many Members of this body, many Members of the House, many distinguished citizens, inventors, soldiers, and sailors who were not born in this country. Merely because a man did not have the good fortune to be born in the United States, as some of us were, I do not think it is fair to impugn his patriotism, or suggest that the fact that he is employed is an indictment of the authority which employs him.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very grateful to the Senator for having made that observation, for fear someone might infer that I was talking about anybody other than aliens, non-citizens, who have been employed by our Government. I recognize that much of the development of this country is attributable to the brawn and brain of those who came from abroad. After all, the first to land upon these shores were those who came from abroad. In the very beginning, our forefathers were all aliens. I am confining my remarks to noncitizens of the United States, those who have not made application for citizenship, aliens in this country who have been employed by our Government in the face of the fact that millions in this country were looking for employment. I know that some of the most distinguished Members of Congress, and others, who have contributed greatly to the upbuilding and development of this country, were born abroad. Let it not be thought for a moment that I reflected upon anybody. I was confining my remarks to aliens who have been employed by the Government when we had millions of unemployed. I was basing my statement upon an article which I hold in my hand. If what the article says is not true, we can ascertain it by having the writer of the article and those who gave him the information appear before a committee designated to ascertain the truth or falsity of the article.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not read the article referred to, and I have no knowledge about the Department of Commerce having any aliens in its employ. Does the article mention the names of any aliens employed in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It does not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know the names of any aliens employed in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to ask the Senator a question about the article. As I heard it—I may not have heard it correctly, of course—the article itself did not necessarily refer to aliens but referred to foreign-born employees. So far as I have heard the Senator read the article, every one of them may have been a naturalized citizen of the United States. I think the Senator makes a mistake in assuming that the foreign-born employees mentioned in the article are aliens. I should like very respectfully to call his attention to the fact that that does not necessarily follow, although it may be true.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much, for the reason that he has suggested to my mind an activity in which I shall indulge to the extent of immediately ascertaining from those in charge of the Department of Commerce and those in charge of every other branch of the Government whether or not any aliens, noncitizens, are employed by our Government today. I shall happily stand or fall upon the sworn

testimony, if necessary, which I secure from the heads of the departments of the Government. I say to my distinguished colleagues who have honored me by these inquiries that I shall make an inquiry today, officially, in the proper form, and I shall be happy to report to the Senate the minute I am in receipt of the information.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In line with the distinction drawn by the Senator from Nebraska between enemy aliens and foreign-born citizens, I should like to recall the fact that one of the cruelest, most unfair, and most unwise things I ever saw in my life was perpetrated upon a man who had been a citizen of this country for a great many years. He came here from Germany. He had been brought over from Germany by his parents when he was a small boy. He had been in the National Guard of the State of Texas for more than 30 years. He had risen to the command of one of the best infantry outfits in the Texas National Guard. I think he was a senior colonel in the Texas National Guard. I had the pleasure and the honor of being associated with him at an Army school in San Antonio.

When the Thirty-sixth Division was ordered overseas this man, who had lived in the United States practically all his life, with the exception of 3 or 4 years, one of the ablest officers in the whole National Guard of the United States, a man who enjoyed the confidence and esteem of everybody in the whole State of Texas who knew him, and particularly the National Guard of the State of Texas, boarded the ship in command of his regiment to go overseas. As the ship was ready to sail he was taken off the ship and held in the United States because, forsooth, he happened to have been born in Germany. I say that was a very cruel and very unwise performance. He lived only a few years longer. He died of a broken heart because the regiment which he had formed and expected to lead went to France without him. I say that to hold that he was not fit to lead his regiment to France because he happened to have been born in Germany was very cruel and unjust.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator. Let me repeat, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, that my remarks refer to noncitizens, to aliens in this country. I was particularly referring to them in my reference to this article. In order that the article may be embodied in the RECORD at this juncture, I wish to read it:

Activities of every foreign-born person in the Department of Commerce are being listed in a secret survey begun less than 36 hours ago.

I infer from the term "foreign-born" that of necessity they must be aliens, because surely our Government would not be called upon to watch the activities of American citizens. That was certainly the natural inference for me to draw from the article.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator think it is really fair to the Department of Commerce, because the article says the Department is checking up on foreign-born persons who are employed by the Department, to assume that they are aliens? Would it not be more logical to assume that they are citizens of the United States, but that as a matter of protection the Department is undertaking to check up on any activities which might not be in harmony with our interest? Why assume that the Department of Commerce has employed a number of aliens, because they happen to be foreign-born, rather than to assume that they are foreign-born, but naturalized, citizens of the United States?

I do not know what are the facts. I do not know whether or not a single alien is employed by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Has the Senator heard that aliens are employed by the Department of Commerce?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I have not heard that they are or are not. At one time the Department of Commerce had agents in some foreign countries where it had offices, undertaking to procure markets for our products. It is possible that some

stenographers or file clerks in those offices were citizens of the countries in which the offices were located. I do not know about that, but it is entirely possible.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am not speaking of that. I am speaking of aliens who are employed by the Department of Commerce in Washington.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know of a single one, and I have never heard that any such were employed. I think we ought to ascertain what the facts are before we assume that simply because the Department is checking up on foreign-born employees, they are all aliens.

Mr. REYNOLDS. My assumption was based upon the statement to the effect that foreign-born employees were being watched, or something of that sort. I never could bring myself to the assumption that our Government would watch any American citizen employed by our Government here in the Capital, because there is no distinction in my mind between a foreign-born citizen and a native-born citizen. I never have drawn such a distinction. I never shall draw any such distinction. I am predicating my argument and my assumption upon the newspaper article; and the moment I finish speaking today I shall seek the author of the article, and immediately thereafter I shall, if possible, go personally to the Department of Commerce and ascertain whether or not there are any noncitizens, aliens, now working in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is commendable on the part of the Senator to ascertain the facts; but I am not so certain that he should not have done that before he made the charge based upon the article, which, it seems to me, does not justify the statement that the Department of Commerce is harboring a number of aliens in Washington as employees.

If they are doing it, I think, of course, it should be known, but we ought to know the facts—

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly we ought to know them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before we draw any deductions in times such as these, based upon suspicion. We ought to ascertain what the facts are before we charge any misconduct or wrongdoing on the part of any department of the Government in the matter of the employment of aliens.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I assume, therefore, that the Senator will agree with me that if the Department of Commerce has in its employ today aliens, that Department is subject certainly to criticism by those who do not see eye to eye with it. All in the world I am trying to do is to ascertain as to whether or not there are aliens in Government employ. What do I mean by "aliens?" An alien is a noncitizen. I am not talking about American citizens; I am not talking about those who have come to our shores and, appreciating the great value and worth of American institutions, have acquired citizenship. We have welcomed such people of fine, upstanding character, who have contributed very largely to the upbuilding of our country, and I am, indeed, regretful if a single word fell from my lips that would leave the impression, the slightest iota of an idea, to the effect that I reflected upon any foreign-born citizens, for some of the very best friends I have in this country are foreign-born who have become naturalized citizens. I am merely basing my argument upon this article, and I will bring other articles to the attention of the Senate.

I wish to say further that I shall call at the Department of Commerce, as well as other departments, and I shall ascertain if there are any aliens employed under our Government, and, if so, where they are employed, what they are doing, and what salaries they derive. Then we may discuss the question why the directors of Government departments and bureaus, if they have done so, have seen fit to give employment to foreigners, noncitizens of the United States, when there are millions of American citizens out of employment. So long as there is breath in my body, and so long as I am a Member of the Senate, I propose to speak out for the employment of American citizens in preference to the employment of foreigners.

In a few moments I will come to an amendment which I intend to offer to the pending bill, and which is designed to

exclude all aliens from employment, with the exception of 10 percent, and of that 10 percent preference must be given to aliens who have made application for American citizenship. I give notice now, in advance, that the amendment I am about to offer goes further than the one which I offered the other day for the protection of the American citizen, in that it requires that 90 percent of all money paid out in salaries or expenses shall be paid to American citizens, and only 10 percent may be paid to foreigners.

That amendment will probably be objected to by the motion-picture industry of this country. I am going to mention that briefly now but I shall come back to it. Why will it be thus objected to? Because it seems to me that, regardless of any alleged difficulty in providing artists sufficient for the motion-picture industry who are natives of the United States—and by that I mean those who are citizens of the United States—the industry sends abroad to bring foreign artists to this country; and, in many instances, the foreign star of a motion-picture feature or production will get about as much as all the Americans working there, scene shifters, painters, electricians, and others.

My amendment is aimed at what? It is aimed to try to keep some of the money paid out by the industry for American citizens; it is aimed, I will say without hesitation, to keep opportunity for such labor away from aliens; it is aimed, on the contrary, to provide that labor for Americans. It is aimed to put that money in the pockets of American citizens; it is aimed to keep that money out of the pockets of aliens. I have no apology to make to a single person under the blue heavens for trying to provide protection for the American citizen in preference to aliens, and I repeat that when I speak of "aliens" I speak of noncitizens. I have never had in my mind other than noncitizens when from time to time and year in and year out upon the floor of the Senate I have talked about the alien menace in this country.

Again I say, thank Heaven above, that at last the American people are awakening to the fact that the "fifth column" is here and the Trojan horses in great herds are grazing upon the green, tender grasses of the pastures of America.

Mr. President, in order that those who read the RECORD, and those who do me the honor to listen, may know its import, I desire to read the article in full. The paragraph which I am about to read is the opening paragraph of this article by Mr. Edmond Monk, and the first paragraph is in type larger than those which follow:

Activities of every foreign-born person in the Department of Commerce are being listed in a secret survey begun less than 36 hours ago.

Was it not the perfectly natural thing for me without hesitation to assume that those mentioned as "foreign-born" were aliens? Was not that the inference to be drawn? I have never cast a reflection upon anybody who is foreign, knowing, as I do, that two of the ablest and most distinguished Members of this, the greatest deliberative legislative body in all the world, were born abroad, and knowing that some of the greatest contributions made to American civilization have been made by those of foreign birth; but I made this assumption because I cannot fashion in my mind the Department of Commerce listing in a secret survey those who are foreign-born unless they are non-Americans, unless they are aliens, and unless they are non-American citizens. The article continues:

Crews of merchant vessels under the Department's guidance are being questioned as are airway personnel and workers in other vital parts of the agency.

CONCERNED OVER SABOTAGE

"Fifth column" activities in other lands have had grave reactions in the minds of Federal officials, it was indicated, and every effort to eliminate sabotage potentialities and other subversive activity is being taken.

The inquiry is believed a part of the vast defense program set rolling by the President, and it is expected will eventually encompass all Federal establishments.

I read this article in conjunction with my resolution to investigate the "fifth column" because the paragraph which

I have just read and which I shall read again interests itself to a large degree in my resolution. I read again:

The inquiry is believed a part of the vast defense program set rolling by the President, and it is expected will eventually encompass all Federal establishments.

Commander Richard S. Field, of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, last night admitted the survey was under way. He indicated intentions of "higher ups" to keep the inquiry secret, and refused at this time to give further details.

From various sources it was learned that no idea is held of intimidating loyal foreign-born persons into giving up their jobs. But a knowledge of the affiliations and activities of all such persons is earnestly sought.

SHIPYARDS SCRUTINIZED

Presumably a strong weather eye is thus being kept on shipyards, factories, and other industrial plants where Federal inspection agencies have personnel or where their employees operate from time to time. Along with this surmise is connected the speed-up program of national-defense production shortly to get under way.

The resolution submitted by me a few moments ago providing for an investigation of the "fifth column" interests itself exclusively in the matter of national defense.

Prior to and during the World War, it was recalled, agents of foreign powers succeeded in blowing up a number of munitions and industrial plants and committed other subversive acts.

In reference to the "fifth column," I am now going to bring to the attention of the Senate a clipping in regard to the "sixth column." I stated that we had the Trojan horses and members of the "fifth column" to the north of us, to the south of us, to the east and west of us, and right here with us; but there is today a "sixth column," not only in Canada but a "sixth column" has been created right here in the United States—in the South, in the State of Georgia, and yonder in the great State of Texas. I shall read in a few moments with regard to the "sixth column" in Texas and in Georgia, as well as the "sixth columns" in Canada, which I shall now bring to the attention of the Senate.

This is from Montreal, Quebec, May 23:

There is a fear in Montreal that the current nation-wide agitation for rooting out "fifth columnists" in this country may result in the formation of a "sixth column" that will take the law into its own hands.

I assume, from that statement, that this "sixth column" has been formed because the Canadian Government did not take steps to guard against the "fifth column" there; and, as the result, the nationals of Great Britain in Canada are intending to take the law into their own hands in the form of a "sixth column" to put down the subversive activities of the "fifth column" just to the north of us.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. When the able Senator speaks of the "fifth column" and "sixth column" I am wondering if there is not a "seventh column" somewhere. What became of the \$7,000,000,000 we appropriated for preparedness in the last 7 years? Has that disappeared? Now they say we have no adequate defense. What became of the \$300,000,000 of American warships sunk in the Atlantic Ocean by the administration in the years 1921 to 1923? I wonder if a "seventh column" had something to do with that. When you investigate these columns do not forget the European-minded un-American "seventh column" and the American warships they sank.

We had nearly \$300,000,000 of great American ships, placing the American Navy in the position of the greatest and most powerful navy in the world. Then suddenly, in conference with foreign powers, we evidently permitted some "seventh column" to persuade the administration of that day to sink it, and so we put the American Navy into second place. Is that good Americanism? I call that Europeanism. I call that distinctly pro-British.

I could not help but wonder yesterday, if the Senator will pardon me, when we were voting for the passage of the naval bill—we have voted, now, considerably over \$3,000,000,000 in 24 hours—if perhaps that "seventh column" is still operating.

Foreign influence may once again persuade the gullible pro-Europeans to scrap our ships—scuttle and sink them once again into second place, now that we have again reached first place among the navies of the world. How many columns are we going to have in this country? Is there some sort of a column somewhere wasting our defense money?

I was reading in today's newspaper just now that if the American Army goes to war it will have to go in overalls. The newspaper said there are not enough uniforms for the Army. It seems to me \$7,000,000,000 ought to give us some money for uniforms. Seven billion dollars ought to supply guns, ammunition, ships, and airplanes, and even a few uniforms.

Not long ago I put into the RECORD a statement showing that there has been expended in this country during the past 50 years nearly \$40,000,000,000 for preparedness, including our recent hysteria. I do not desire to interfere with the Senator's able argument, but I am wondering what became of all this money, and if the "seventh column" had anything to do with it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will answer the Senator by saying that my remarks were intended exclusively to describe those who constitute the "fifth column," and the nationals of Canada who are now getting ready to constitute what is known as a "sixth column." In reference to the "seventh column" mentioned by the Senator in reference to our Navy, I am very happy to say that our naval experts revealed only a few days ago before one of our committees, and, as a matter of fact, that was in turn revealed through the press, that our Navy today is in better shape than it ever was before, and that now, as a matter of fact, it is about the strongest Navy in the world.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I agree with the able Senator. Yesterday I placed in the RECORD, in some remarks of mine, statistics given in the Times-Herald yesterday morning that our Navy is now the largest and best Navy in all the world; but, at the same time, we are told that we have no adequate defense, and that we are in imminent danger of being invaded. When every military and naval authority will tell you that a navy or navies coming here from their bases across the sea must be three times as powerful as ours in order successfully to attack us over here. They will have to have three times the power we have because of distance and lack of bases. We already have the greatest naval power in the world. So in one breath it is said that we have the greatest Navy in the world, which I hope is true—and I have great respect for the American Navy and its fine personnel—and then again in debate we hear that we have no adequate defense. It just does not make good, common sense. The \$7,000,000,000 seems to have disappeared, and yet they say we cannot defend our country. That is what I had reference to, if I may say so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I gladly yield to our distinguished leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. Nobody has stated, in the Senate or anywhere else, that we have no defense. Nobody who has any authority or any right to speak on the subject has stated that the \$7,000,000,000 has disappeared. It is not fair to our Army or Navy, or to our public officers, to get up here and make irresponsible statements that we have no defense, and that all this money has gone into a sinkhole. If the Senator from Minnesota thinks we do not need to defend ourselves better, and that it takes three times as many ships to come over here and invade us as it takes to defend us, he should have voted against the naval bill on yesterday, which he did not do.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I wish to say to the able Senator from Kentucky, if the Senator from North Carolina will permit me, that at least I did not vote to sink the Navy, to scrap and scuttle our great, fine ships, as was done by treaty in 1921 to 1923, and ratified by the Senate.

Mr. President, permit me to read to the Senate information on that point handed me by our legislative reference bureau:

SCRAPPING AND SINKING AMERICAN WARSHIPS—SHIPS DISPOSED OF UNDER
TERMS OF WASHINGTON TREATY (1923)

Number disposed of (sunk)-----	31
Tonnage (sunk)-----	767,880
Total net cost of scrapping (including value of vessels)-----	\$277,695,994.34

The American members of the Washington conference who agreed to this appalling act of sabotage are recorded in our permanent records. Now let me quote Admiral Clark H. Woodward:

SAYS UNITED STATES NAVY IS SMALLER THAN IT WAS 18 YEARS AGO

New York, April 17.—Rear Admiral Clark H. Woodward, commandant of the New York Naval District, today urged the construction of an American Navy "second to none * * * in order that no predatory militaristic power dare challenge us."

"Such a navy is necessary particularly in the world of today, where force plays the dominant role in the affairs of nations," he said.

At present, he said, the United States Navy is "definitely no better than second place, with Japan pushing us closely for that. The astounding fact not generally known by the public is that the Navy's total tonnage today is only 75 percent of that possessed 18 years ago," he added.

"This resulted from scrapping nearly a million tons following the Washington and London conferences of 1921 and 1930 and because for nearly 12 years we deliberately failed to provide a building program—even for the replacement of old and obsolete vessels."

The admiral forgets, however, here that the British Navy is now whittled down by war into second place. The admiral evidently uses pre-war figures in placing our Navy second.

The American taxpayer must never forget that he paid for the world's greatest navy, that these ships were scrapped and sunk, and Admiral Woodward now states that we have never been able to recover that lost and scuttled tonnage.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who are those Senators who proposed to sink the American Navy? Who voted here in the Senate to sink the American Navy?

Mr. LUNDEEN. If the able Senator will permit me, I may take occasion to place in the RECORD the roll call on that very proposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. It will be a very interesting roll call if the Senator can ever find one of that sort.

WHO SCRAPPED THE AMERICAN NAVY INTO SECOND PLACE?

Mr. LUNDEEN. It probably can be found, and I refer our distinguished leader to pages 4718 and 4719 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 29, 1922, volume 62, part 5, of the Sixty-seventh Congress, second session. A lengthy debate on the subject of scrapping and scuttling of our fleet is found in the same volume 62 on the 27th, 28th, and 29th of March 1922.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, continuing with the article in particular reference to a description of a so-called "sixth column" of Canada, I read:

MONTREAL FEARS "SIXTH COLUMN" WILL TRY VIGILANTES' "CURE"

MONTREAL, QUEBEC, May 23.—There is a fear in Montreal that the current nation-wide agitation for rooting out "fifth columnists" in this country may result in the formation of a "sixth column" that will take the law into its own hands.

The Pan Canadian Union, urging the Government to curb subversive activities in Canada, today issued a warning against the fostering of spy hysteria. The union's president, Real Rousseau, declared that his organization disapproved of the formation of vigilantes. He stressed the danger of vigilantes getting out of control and possibly injuring innocent people.

Meantime, scores of societies and organizations forwarded resolutions to Ottawa urging Government action against "fifth columnists." Included is the Montreal Board of Trade, which sent a telegram to Prime Minister Mackenzie King declaring that Canada was not spending enough money in guarding the nation against saboteurs.

The Canadian Legion convention meets here Monday, and it is believed discussions will lead to a demand for the employment of ex-service men in antisabotage work. One local branch of the Legion is reported to have prepared a "black list" of suspected persons.

A mass rally organized by the Pan Canadian Union is to be staged in Montreal Monday night.

I am particularly indebted at this moment to my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from the great Commonwealth of Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] for having just brought to my attention in connection with this subject, which I think is important, an article in today's Washington Daily News, Friday, May 24, 1940, at the bottom of the page thereof, which reads:

ALIENS SAILING UNITED STATES SHIPS RECORDED BY COMMERCE

Commerce Secretary Hopkins has ordered a check-up on alien seamen as a precaution against "fifth column" activities, it was announced today. Officials said the object was to get a record of the aliens and that no "red" hunt was in prospect.

The Department is said to be concerned mainly with aliens on ships plying in coastwise trade, but the survey will cover all American ships.

I am glad that at last the Department of Commerce—at last means today—is looking into the activities of aliens. It seems to be getting busy now when, lo and behold, it may be too late in this country, as too late they found it to be in Norway, in Denmark, in Holland, in Belgium, and in other sections of the world.

Let us see about the "fifth column" activities, which "fifth column" embodies not a thing in the world but the same old words "alien enemies."

Here is an article from the Times-Herald entitled "Justice Department Orders Nation-wide Check of Aliens."

Is there any objection to that? None whatever. The only criticism I have to direct at that movement is that we did not 5 years ago or 10 years ago interest ourselves in the very subject which today is commanding the attention of the American people as never before it did.

What does this article say? It is from the Times-Herald, and reads as follows:

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ORDERS NATION-WIDE CHECK OF ALIENS

(By Jack Purcell)

Plans for a Nation-wide check-up of aliens and a summons to citizens to report evidence of sabotage and espionage yesterday high lighted the Justice Department's drive against "fifth column" activities in the United States.

"Fifth column" activities are what the resolution presented by me today covers. The article continues:

An additional \$100,000 was asked for by the Dies committee which reported that its present staff of seven investigators was not large enough to handle a flood of information on "fifth column" activities.

NO CAUSE FOR ALARM

Reassurance was given by Attorney General Robert H. Jackson that there was no cause for alarm, that the F. B. I. is "capably, zealously, and effectively" protecting the United States against the Trojan-horse tactics of foreign governments.

Incidentally, it is my direct information that prior to the declaration of war, on September 3, 1939, by Great Britain and France upon Germany, the Department of Justice received annually an average of only about 250 complaints of sabotage and espionage, whereas now that Department is receiving an approximate average of 250 complaints daily, at a time when we are actually at peace.

The article continues:

As part of the President's plan to meet "fifth column" inroads, the F. B. I. was enlarged and an appeal sent to law-enforcement agencies everywhere to cooperate with the Bureau, Jackson said.

Emphasizing that subversive activities cannot be dealt with on a local or voluntary organization basis, Jackson appealed to United States citizens to aid their Government. They can do so, he said, by reporting to the F. B. I. "acts, threats, or evidence of sabotage, espionage, or other disloyal activities."

He warned Americans not to join any organization until they know the source of its funds, their associates in the organization, and its backer, and the use made of their dues or contributions. This warning was swiftly interpreted as being directed against the German-American Bund and organizations that are used as fronts by the Communist Party.

JACKSON URGES CALM

"Lastly, the greatest help to the Government that citizens can render is to keep cool and not become frightened," Jackson declared.

I thank Mr. Jackson for that statement, because today we are hysterical, and more so than ever before, unless it was the time just prior to our entrance into the World War, in April 1917.

He continued:

Sensational statements as to the "fifth column" should be received with suspicion.

I hope so.

Discussing the impending transfer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to the Justice Department, Jackson said that it will be possible to maintain an adequate current and centralized record of the whereabouts of aliens throughout the Nation. The transfer was requested by the President, and legislation for its sanction unanimously approved by a House committee.

At last we find that there is a desire, a widespread desire, for the very thing for which I have been pleading for years, that is, the fingerprinting and the registration of aliens; and when I employ the term "aliens" I think only and speak only of noncitizens in this country. I shall continue, so long as there is the breath of life in my body, to champion the interests of the American people in preference to the interests of those who are not citizens of the United States.

The subcaption of the next paragraph is:

WANTS FINGERPRINTS

As a counter measure against the infiltration of subversive aliens—

And there must be some aliens in this country who are engaging in subversive, un-American activities. DIES has said so; the Attorney General says so. He says—

As a countermeasure against the infiltration of subversive aliens, Jackson—

That is, the Attorney General of the United States, and an able one—

recommended that the identification by photograph and signature of aliens seeking entrance into the United States be supplemented by fingerprint identification.

Thank heaven, at last the heads of our Government have come to the conclusion that in this hour of emergency we are entitled to know where the aliens in this country are, and after we ascertain their whereabouts we can inquire whether they are friendly aliens, or whether they are unfriendly aliens, and are engaged in un-American, subversive activities.

I am very happy that our able Attorney General, Mr. Jackson, has arrived at the conclusion that the American people are entitled to know where the aliens in this country are.

He said that such a system is being considered and would enable the Government to ascertain in advance whether an alien should be denied admittance because of criminal activity.

Here is an article about an inventor. This is a dispatch from New York, dated May 23, by the United Press:

Inventor offers way to trap "fifth column."

It seems that everyone now is interested in the "fifth column." After all these years, for the first time people have become interested in alien enemies. This article states:

Roy Post, New York criminologist and inventor, yesterday proposed a "sixth column"—armed with lie detectors—to trap the "fifth column" in the United States.

Mr. Post said he would train 10 or 12 operators, equip them with lie detectors, and send them into strategic industries which might be subject to sabotage.

Mr. President, a moment ago I brought to the attention of the Members of the Senate information about the "sixth column" in Canada. Now let us see about the "sixth column" in the United States. I mentioned Georgia. I have here a clipping from a Washington newspaper which was handed to me yesterday by a gentleman who is connected with the Government.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Texas,

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very much interested in the Senator's discussion, and with relation to the "fifth column," the deporting of aliens and things of that kind, I call his attention to the Smith bill, which has already passed the House of Representatives and has been before the Committee on the

Judiciary of the Senate for a considerable period. In fact, the Judiciary Committee at the close of the last session reported the bill favorably to the Senate, but on motion it was recommended to the Committee on the Judiciary. The chairman of that committee appointed the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY], as a subcommittee to consider the bill. Last week we held rather extensive hearings on the measure, and it is expected that the subcommittee will tomorrow vote to report the bill to the full Committee on the Judiciary on Monday.

This bill takes care of sabotage and espionage, and the so-called "fifth column" activities, the activities of those who seek to influence members of the military and naval forces not to fight, and to engage in disloyalty and treachery. It also greatly widens the ground for deporting aliens and makes mandatory rather than discretionary some of the powers which formerly were reposed in the Secretary of Labor but are now under the Department of Justice.

I thought the Senator would probably be glad to be advised that some of us really are trying to have enacted at this session legislation to meet the very emergent conditions which the Senator so eloquently points out.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Texas, for having made that observation at this time. I wish to say in appreciation of his remarks that for many years I have known of the very sincere and patriotic interest of my distinguished friend from Texas concerning these matters. I have read the Smith bill very carefully. I read it last year when it was introduced. I am thoroughly in favor of every feature of the bill, and I sincerely hope that it will be possible to pass the bill in the Senate at the present session, because it will do exactly what the able Senator from Texas says it will do.

As the Senator knows, I have introduced a number of bills which are pending before the Committee on Immigration, dealing with deportation of alien criminals, limitation of immigration, with subversive and un-American activities, and with fingerprinting and registration of aliens. I have not been able to have those bills reported from the committee, but that is no fault of the able chairman, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I further wish to say to the Senator from Texas that I shall support the Smith bill as enthusiastically as I would support my own bill, because I declare to the Senator and to all others that I have no pride whatsoever of authorship. The only thing I have endeavored to do during the years since I have been in the Senate is to bring about the passage of legislation which I believe would be for the protection and the benefit of the people of the United States, and now at last I believe I am about to witness the fruit of the labors of those Americans who, like my distinguished friend, the Senator from Texas, have interested themselves in this matter. I hope his committee will report the legislation to the Senate, because the American people as a whole are interested in the legislation which my distinguished colleague is sponsoring in the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from North Carolina very much. I wish to assure him, however, that the action of the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee is not based upon any desire, or even willingness, to deprive the Senator from North Carolina of any credit or honor due to him for the very aggressive and active campaign he has been conducting. The bill, however, came to the Judiciary Committee in the regular course, in the form of a House bill. It is not intended by the committee in anywise to transgress or to invade the authority or jurisdiction of the Committee on Immigration. But the Senator from North Carolina knows that that committee has not reported the measures to which he referred, and we thought that under the circumstances we ought to report the House bill.

Allow me to say to the Senator that the bill, if enacted, will cover the vast field of so-called subversive activities quite thoroughly and completely.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] has come into the Chamber since I had the honor of interrupting the Senator from North Carolina a moment ago. I am sure he will bear witness to what I have said, that it is the purpose of the subcommittee to report the bill to the full committee Monday, with the belief that the full committee will probably report the bill to the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is splendid. Again I thank my distinguished friend and colleague the Senator from Texas for the observation which he has so ably made at this opportune and propitious time.

I spoke a moment ago about the "sixth column." I have before me an article headed—

Anti "fifth column" campaign in Georgia smoking out aliens.

I infer that means the "sixth column," in view of the fact it is stated to be anti "fifth column."

The article reads as follows:

Anti "fifth column" campaign in Georgia smoking out aliens.

Again I say that for the first time in the history of this country people are interesting themselves in aliens, concerning whom I have been talking for years, and concerning whom I expect to continue to talk so long as American citizens are out of jobs and aliens are holding jobs that should belong to American citizens.

The article is by the Associated Press, and is dated Atlanta, May 23, as follows:

New support for Georgia's anti "fifth column" campaign appeared today while aliens swamped local offices seeking to register.

Abit Nix, Athens attorney and possible gubernatorial candidate, endorsed Gov. E. D. Rivers' proclamation requesting all aliens in Georgia to register and be fingerprinted. His statement opposed the American Civil Liberties Union's announced intention to prevent State action.

I see coming into the Chamber now an able Member of this body, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and I will state for his information that I was just beginning to read a dispatch from Atlanta, Ga., by the Associated Press, and I wish to reread what I have heretofore read, because I know the Senator from Georgia is thoroughly interested in preventing anti-American activities. He is interested in stopping the formation of "fifth columns." He is interested in the Government being able to ascertain where the aliens are, and thus ascertain whether they are friendly or unfriendly.

The article is by the Associated Press, dated Atlanta, May 23, as follows:

ATLANTA, May 23.—New support for Georgia's anti "fifth column" campaign appeared today while aliens swamped local offices seeking to register.

So, there are aliens down in Georgia. I did not know any were there, but there appear to be some.

Abit Nix, Athens attorney and possible gubernatorial candidate, endorsed Gov. E. D. Rivers' proclamation requesting all aliens in Georgia to register and be fingerprinted. His statement opposed the American Civil Liberties Union's announced intention to prevent State action.

EXPLAINS POSITION

"None of us wants a peaceful, well-intentioned foreign resident in our State to be molested," Mr. Nix said yesterday.

That, Mr. President, is perfectly all right.

"At the same time, none of us wants organizations such as the Civil Liberties Union to obstruct efforts by State governments to augment the arm of the Federal Government in finding out who is carrying on under cover against our country."

The Jewish War Veterans' Atlanta post pledged its support to the Governor and President Roosevelt "in their militant stand against the 'fifth column' and all other subversive organizations."

State Welfare Director Braswell Deen said he would ask county directors immediately to drop from social-security beneficiary rolls all persons not American citizens.

At last they seem to be coming to the point where they are going to take care of American citizens first, and thank God for that.

The article continues:

Aliens seek information.

The Federal district court has been besieged by aliens seeking information as to how to become naturalized.

I wonder why they did not seek that information earlier. I do not know. I will not assume to say. But I ask the question: Why did they not become naturalized American citizens before?

A number have applied for naturalization.

They are late in the day in doing so.

About 25 aliens visited the Atlanta Police Identification Bureau to be fingerprinted but were advised to wait until further notice. The bureau is not organized for the additional duty, it was explained.

That is, the fingerprinting of aliens. Congratulations to the great State of Georgia.

Let us see what else we find. It seems there is a "sixth column" in the State of Texas, according to a report which I have in my hand, and "all I know is what I read in the papers."

Four hundred angry Texans chase three Nazi agents from town.

If the law will not take care of the situation the citizens there take the law into their own hands, and that constitutes the "sixth column."

The article is from Del Rio, Tex., dated May 22:

FOUR HUNDRED ANGRY TEXANS CHASE THREE NAZI AGENTS FROM TOWN
DEL RIO, Tex., May 22.—Four hundred angry citizens, many of them women, chased three professed German agents out of Del Rio today.

The three—a man and two women—were set upon by the crowd while they were distributing Nazi pamphlets.

As they left the city the man shouted:

"If we leave, hundreds will take our place."

They meant that there were many more members of the "fifth column," but they were properly handled by the members of the "sixth column" in the great patriotic State of Texas. The article continues:

American Legionnaires carried an American flag and demanded that the three salute it.

"That is nothing but a dirty rag," said Louis Beehler, of Scotland, S. Dak., one of the three.

Mr. President, are there enemies of this country in the United States today? Here is a man who refers to the American flag as "nothing but a dirty rag." The time has come when we should deal with the enemies of this Government, but unfortunately we have not made appropriations heretofore for that purpose.

Legion Commander R. H. Wood quieted the crowd and advised the three to move on. They left toward Uvalde, home of Vice President JOHN N. GARNER, escorted to the city limits by police.

I wish to place in the RECORD another article entitled "Roosevelt Asks Curb on Aliens."

I am not the only one who is asking a curb on the aliens. I am asking a curb on the aliens only because I am interested in the citizens of the United States before I am interested in the citizens of any other country in the world.

The article reads:

President Roosevelt warned Congress—

This is in reference to the reorganization message which the President sent to Congress the other day, concerning which I spoke, but I read the article because it relates to the "fifth column," to which I am endeavoring to confine my remarks:

President Roosevelt warned Congress yesterday that the "startling sequence of events" abroad—"fifth column" treachery—demands more effective defense against trouble-making aliens in this country.

The President obviously referred to the Trojan-horse tactics of the Nazis in a message urging approval of his proposed transfer of the Labor Department's Immigration and Naturalization Service to the Justice Department. Simultaneously, Representative MARTIN DIES (Democrat), of Texas, introduced a bill reducing immigration quotas by one-third.

"Under existing conditions the immigration and naturalization activities can best contribute to the national well-being only if they are closely integrated with the Justice Department," the President said.

While the transfer, involving 1,000 inspectors and 800 patrolmen, is designed to afford more effective control over aliens, Mr. Roosevelt explained it does not reflect any intention to deprive the 3,000,000 aliens here of civil liberties or impair their legal status.

But, he added, it will enable the Government "to deal quickly with those aliens who conduct themselves in a manner that conflicts with the public interest."

Mr. President, in reference to the statement of the President, and in particular reference to the statement of the Attorney General of the United States, and in further particular reference to the statement of the Governor of Georgia, I have before me an article entitled "S. A. R. Proposes U. S. Register All Aliens." The article reads as follows:

Fingerprinting and registration of all aliens in this country was proposed yesterday by the National Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution.

This action was suggested to the Federal Government as an emergency measure in view of the war in Europe. The group proposed that the Justice Department carry out the recommendation. Other resolutions called for a study of barriers to interstate trade.

Loren Souers, of Canton, Ohio, was elected president-general at the closing session. Four Washingtonians were among those elected to other offices. They included Robert B. Tracy, vice president for the Middle Atlantic area; Frank B. Steele, secretary-registrar-general; Louis C. Smith, librarian-general; and C. Seymour McConnell, trustee for the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, a moment ago I mentioned the termite activities which had been successful in countries abroad, which paved more smoothly the road which enabled the aggressors to make the headway which they have made. I think I mentioned the fact that unfortunately those countries had not well guarded their respective households; otherwise, the aggressions could not have been made with such ease and facility.

I have before me a dispatch from London which mentions the "fifth columnists" in England. Of course, it comes too late. The devilry has already been done. The Trojan horses, the alien enemies, and the "fifth columnists" were already in England. However, about 11,000 of them were put in concentration camps the other day. The article reads:

COMMONS PASSES BILL DOOMING "FIFTH COLUMNISTS"

LONDON, May 23.—The death penalty for "fifth column" treachery was provided in a bill passed last night by the House of Commons.

The measure provides that "if with intent to help the enemy any person does or attempts or conspires with any other person to do any act which is designed or likely to give assistance to naval, military, or air operations of the enemy, to impede such operations of His Majesty's forces, or to endanger life . . . he shall on conviction suffer death."

Attorney General Sir Donald Somervell said parachutists coming down in plain clothes as part of an attacking force would be dealt with "in the same way as people who attacked this country in uniform, with the added disadvantages of not having the privileges attaching in international law to uniformed soldiers."

Any enemy who came down in plain clothes, not as a part of an attack and not armed, but simply hoping he might be able to commit espionage, would be dealt with under the new bill, the attorney general said.

So the "fifth column" members must be a very serious menace to Great Britain, particularly at this hour.

Mr. President, I have before me an article which, judging from the type, was clipped from the Washington Evening Star of May 23, 1940, entitled "House Committee Unanimously Backs Alien Control Plan." The article relates to the reorganization plan, but I wish to read the opening paragraph:

A special House committee unanimously adopted today a resolution for quick congressional approval of President Roosevelt's alien-control order transferring the immigration service from the Labor Department to the Justice Department.

I wish again to say that I am very happy the transfer was made, because in the Justice Department we shall have some action. A number of years ago the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization stated before a committee that there were 20,000 alien criminals in the United States. If Harry Bridges may be taken as an example of deportation, I am ready to assume that the 20,000 alien criminals mentioned by the Commissioner several years ago are still here, and that many more thousands have been added to their number.

Mr. President, I have before me an article headed:

Conservative M. P. arrested as Britain fights "fifth column." Capt. A. H. M. Ramsay, long regarded as a Fascist, is detained.

The "fifth column" is giving untold trouble in the unfortunate countries abroad, and we find at last that the American people are awaking to the danger of the "fifth column" in the United States.

Mr. President, virtually every country in the world is experiencing trouble with "fifth columnists." I have before me an article by the United Press from Turkey. It reads as follows:

TURKEY TIGHTENS LAWS AGAINST "FIFTH COLUMNISTS"

ISTANBUL, TURKEY, May 23.—Burdened with more military secrets than she has possessed since the World War days, and impressed by tales of "fifth column" activities, Turkey is doing everything possible to make espionage a difficult and dangerous occupation.

War Ministry officials have drafted measures tightening the military penal code, all army officers in the Istanbul area have been ordered to shun certain cabarets and restaurants, and strict surveillance of foreigners has been established.

Ever since the start of the war boat load after boat load of new war materials have been arriving from Turkey's allies, Great Britain and France, and hundreds of reservists have been called up to learn how to use them.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks two articles from the Washington Daily News of Friday, May 24, 1940.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOGOTA PAPER LINKS DANCER TO GERMAN "FIFTH COLUMN"

BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, May 24.—While police today pressed a nationwide search for Erika Klein, beautiful German dancer missing since May 16, the newspaper La Razon disputed suicide theories and charged her disappearance was a ruse to cover up "fifth column" activities.

The paper said it could guarantee Miss Klein faked a leap into the 450-foot-high Tequendama Falls, and then fled by auto to Quito, Ecuador, where she is engaged at present in a political mission.

BODY NOT FOUND

La Razon said its information was borne out by the fact that a search of the bottom of the falls and the adjoining shores by police and the dancer's husband, Fritz Wallembergh, a violinist, failed to reveal the body.

According to the paper, Miss Klein went to Quito to join Lila Linka, a German woman writer who, La Razon said, "is a 'fifth column' organizer in countries of North and South America."

The fact that the missing dancer is a Jewess, born in Berlin, is no handicap to her Nazi activities, the paper said.

"Thousands of the servants of nazi-ism in our country find themselves in a similar condition," La Razon said.

VISITED FALLS

The paper said that after leaving the country home at La Vega where she had lived for the past few years with her husband, Miss Klein went first to Facatativa, a town along the main highway to Tequendama Falls. After a stop, she continued to the falls where her presence allegedly was known to employees of a nearby hotel.

She often walked to the very brink of the falls, the paper said, and when other people were near she would pretend to be planning to throw herself over. After establishing a basis for the suicide theory of her disappearance, La Razon said "she sped by auto to Ecuador."

NAZI-BUILT AIR FIELDS IN MEXICO, DIES HEARS

(By Marshall McNeil)

Reports that a series of camouflaged landing fields have been built in Mexico along the Rio Grande have reached Representative MARTIN DIES (Democrat, Texas), chairman of the special House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, he said today.

The reports, he said, are that the fields were built under German supervision and are part of the Mexican defense works.

"I haven't checked the reports," Representative DIES said, "Because I cannot send agents into Mexico to verify them."

Mr. DIES spoke in comment on a Texas newspaper editor's statement that he has confidential information that 26 such fields are scattered south of the border.

The Texas editor said his informant believed the presence of these fields was causing increases in United States Army forces at border forts. But at the War Department it was denied that border post forces have been increased, except slightly in the general boost of Army personnel.

SIX AGENTS INVESTIGATING

Representative DIES said six agents of his committee are making investigations in border cities now, and he intends to visit these cities soon and to conduct hearings there later.

Representative DIES' concern is reflected in reports from the Mexican government and in dispatches from newspaper correspondents in that country.

President Lazaro Cardenas has been quoted as saying any elements, internal or foreign, attempting to endanger Mexico's "absolute neutrality" will be dealt with strongly. An increased influx of Germans into Mexico, nominally as tourists and businessmen, has attracted attention.

PUPPET GOVERNMENT

Mr. DIES believes, he said, that Germany, Russia, and Japan are cooperating to set up a puppet government in Mexico. He repeated his prediction of some weeks ago that revolution is imminent there, and added that the dominance of foreign elements might be seen in "chaos resulting from the [presidential] election" July 7.

Some people, he acknowledged, might think reports he is receiving are fantastic, but he recalled the "fifth column" operations in Norway and elsewhere in Europe.

DIVERSION FOR THE UNITED STATES

Representative DIES believes that the Nazis fear the United States either will enter the European war or send fighting equipment and munitions to the Allies, and are preparing to create a "diversion" for the United States in this hemisphere, making Mexico the first scene of operations.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the only effective way in which we can deal with the "fifth columnists" in this country initially is to bring about the enactment of a registration and fingerprinting law for all aliens, first, in order that we may ascertain the number of aliens in America, and, second, in order that we may ascertain where they are, what they are doing, why they are here, whence they came, how they came, when they came, whether they entered legally or illegally, and, if legally, whether or not they have remained here illegally. After we shall have ascertained those facts we can make inquiry as to whether or not they are engaging in "fifth column," subversive, or un-American activities.

I find on one of the desks an article which appears on page 4 of the Washington Post of Friday, May 24, 1940. The headline, covering four columns, reads:

United States may register 3,000,000 aliens; project to follow transfer approval, Jackson announces.

The first paragraph of the article reads as follows:

Registration—and perhaps, later, fingerprinting—of every 1 of the more than 3,000,000 aliens in the United States would follow transfer of the Immigration Service to the Justice Department, Attorney General Robert H. Jackson announced yesterday.

This article is interesting in connection with the article which I read a moment ago in reference to the transfer of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. President, I find on my desk an article which was evidently placed there by someone, because I have not read it. I shall read slowly; I am reading it for the first time, and I do not want to put into the RECORD as emanating from me anything that I should not like to have there. It is entitled "Harboring Spies—Opposition to Dies Committee Called Dangerous." It is directed to the Public Forum of the New York Herald Tribune and reads:

HARBORING SPIES—OPPOSITION TO DIES COMMITTEE CALLED DANGEROUS
To the New York Herald Tribune:

The insidious propaganda by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, in association with the heads of many of our leading institutions of learning, 148 in all, having for its purposes the nullification of the patriotic work being done by the Dies committee, may not be ignored by those who are at all familiar with the dangers inherent in such official investigation of the most important research agency in the United States.

That this propaganda is in the hands of experienced persons is shown by the timing of its release to the public. They knew that the Dies committee is about ready to expose the widespread activity of aliens in this country. The operations of the "fifth column" in Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and this country during the World War may appear amateurish and negligible when the facts of their operation in this country shall be revealed by the Dies committee and other agencies struggling to save this country from the fate of others. Similar vicious attacks are in progress against the F. B. I., which Mr. Hoover has brought to such a high state of perfection.

That religious and educational institutions, most of whom are largely dependent on public support for existence, should uphold saboteurs of these highly respected governmental agencies is understandable only upon the theory that these good men and women are victims of the enemies of our social order—Hessians of our day.

The investigations of these alien activities reveal, as shown by public record, that:

Espionage and sabotage acts have increased from 7 complaints a year prior to 1928 to 217 complaints daily, or 78,000 annually, at the present time.

There are estimated to be from 4,000,000 to 7,000,000 potential spies in this country today—potential recruits for the "fifth column."

There are over 10,000,000 Americans unemployed, 3,000,000 on W. P. A., 300,000 young men in the C. C. C. camps, and 750,000 boys and girls graduating from our schools and colleges annually, most of them unable to find employment. Aliens and refugees supply the strongest competition for jobs that our unemployed encounter.

The Department of Justice indicates that the cost of crime in this country is about \$15,000,000,000 a year. The amount chargeable to criminal alien activity does not appear to be segregated from the total of the official figures.

I do not see the name of the author. It is not contained on the end of the clipping as handed to me, but, as I stated, it appears to be an article directed to the Public Forum of the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. President, I have here an article which has been brought to my attention, dated New York, May 23, 1940, in which it is stated that:

The American Legion today assailed the civil-liberties bill as a Trojan horse measure and cloak for "fifth column" and wholesale saboteurs.

There has been brought to my attention the fact that on yesterday, May 23, there was introduced into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, without opposition, an article which I am informed is exceedingly interesting, entitled "Spawn of the Trojan Horse," presented by our distinguished colleague, the leader of the minority of this body, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I will take advantage of an early opportunity to read that.

Also there has been brought to my attention by a Member of this body an article, The "Fifth Column," being an extension of the remarks of the Honorable JOHN Z. ANDERSON, of California, a Member of the House of Representatives, which has reference to a very interesting subject, and which I shall endeavor to find time to read.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article by Mr. Ludwell Denny, which has been placed on my desk by someone. The article by Mr. Denny seems to be very interesting. I have only read the first paragraph, but I should like to read it into the RECORD. It is entitled "Spy Hunters," and reads:

A small army of Federal secret police to fight "fifth column" and Trojan-horse activities in this country is a major part of the Roosevelt defense plan.

The President's latest Government reorganization proposal to Congress, involving transfer of the Labor Department's immigration and naturalization service to the Justice Department, is the third and probably not the last step in that program.

First was revival of the once-discredited General Intelligence Division under J. Edgar Hoover, and increased appropriations and powers to hunt spies and prevent sabotage in defense services and industries.

Second was creation of a Neutrality Division in the Justice Department for the same general purposes. Whether this increased or decreased the personal power of Mr. Hoover is still in dispute, with the White House standing by the F. B. I. chief. But there is no disagreement that it enlarges the machinery and intensifies the concentration on espionage.

Espionage is a subject in which we are vitally interested now, because, no doubt, if the European war continues, we will experience a tremendous amount of sabotage in the United States, as we experienced it during the last war before and during our participation therein.

The third move, putting a large Labor Department agency under the Justice Department, is important in coordinating related activities and tightening the dread deportation facilities.

In addition is the activity of the Dies committee of the House. This committee has met more hostility than help from the administration, because of its frequent smear efforts against new dealers.

The liberal bloc in Congress is critical both of the Dies committee and of the Hoover F. B. I. on the ground that the methods of each have violated basic civil rights and tended to destroy the democracy they purported to protect.

Under pressure of the Norris-Wheeler Senate liberals, Attorney General Jackson ordered Chief Hoover to discontinue illegal wire-tapping but whitewashed alleged third-degree methods of G-men in the Detroit Spanish recruiting case raids.

The article continues:

Such investigations and court rulings have confirmed the fears of congressional liberals of the misuse of secret police by alleged Hitlerian and Stalinist methods. But the revelations of "fifth column" Russian tactics in Finland, and of German tactics in

Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France have converted many hitherto hostile liberals to the Roosevelt doctrine that American secret police are needed.

They are needed now badly. I read further from the article by Mr. Denny:

Therefore the civil-liberties fight here is shifting. The new pressure is not against the Roosevelt plan for better protection from actual subversive elements. It is against the Roosevelt method of entrusting the job to discredited machinery, or to experts in ordinary types of crime.

If there are spies and sabotaging agents in this country, foreign or native, why, after 9 months, have so few been caught, it is asked?

Why is there need for an indiscriminating Dies committee, and its recurring claims of discovery of vast plots, if the Justice Department is doing efficiently the job it is paid to do?

On the basis of meager results in the last 9 months it appears that Federal and private secret police have been out to get holders of unpopular opinions rather than actual law violators. The labor organizers and radical orators, who are protected by our Constitution, apparently engage most of the attention, while actual spies and wreckers reportedly carry on their crimes.

It is suggested that spies usually do not carry banners, shout from platforms, demand higher wages, or otherwise spotlight themselves. Antilabor thugs of the private-police variety, exposed in the La Follette Committee report, cannot be expected to catch clever operators. Nor is the G-man, trained to hunt the common type of criminal, apt to be expert in detecting illegal political agents.

Therefore, liberal Senators challenge the part of the Roosevelt defense plan because:

So far it operates to violate civil rights and to intimidate legal criticism of the Government.

So far it nets minnows instead of big fry, crackpots instead of criminals, soapboxers instead of spies.

I read that merely for what it is worth, it not having been clipped by me but placed on my desk evidently by someone who was interested in the subject under consideration.

Mr. President, in reference to the "fifth column" which I spoke of as being in the north and in the south, in Mexico, I have a statement in print from the columns of the Washington Daily News of Saturday, May 18, 1940, entitled "Dies Warns United States To Keep Close Watch on Mexico":

Representative MARTIN DIES (Democrat, Texas) said in an interview today that the United States Government needs to watch Mexico at least as closely as it watches warring Europe.

Of course, we all know that there are "fifth columns" in virtually all the countries of Central and South America, as there are in the United States today. That is realized by everybody who is familiar with the Latin-American situation; nobody will deny that to be so; and, as a matter of fact, those constituting the "fifth column," the Nazis and Communists and Fascists, in South America are giving our officials a considerable amount of concern today, as virtually everyone knows.

Mr. DIES predicted, on evidence he said he had received from trustworthy sources, that a revolution would be attempted in Mexico, under leadership of both Nazi and Communist forces, soon after the Mexican Presidential election in July.

The object, he said, would be to set up a puppet state in Mexico, directed through remote control by Hitler and Stalin, with its main object the diversion of American interest from the European conflict.

FOLLOW SPANISH PLAN

Lines will be formed in Mexico, he predicted, somewhat like those of the recent Spanish civil war, and some of the participants will be the same. He said he had information that 10,000 Spanish Loyalist veterans have been colonized in Mexico, that German agents are "steadily infiltrating" into the country, and that Communists and Nazis are working closely together.

"Much of my information," he said, "is contained in a confidential report I have received from the intelligence service of a very important government, not our own."

"If this revolution comes and the foreign 'isms' get an official foothold so close to our own borders, it is easy to imagine that American concern will be directed southward and our attention will be pretty thoroughly diverted from the tragic events in Europe."

ANOTHER PREDICTION

Mr. DIES made another prediction—that the first manifestation of "fifth column" activity in the United States would come in strikes and slow-downs connected with the shipment abroad of airplanes and other essentials for the Allies.

"That traffic has not really got under way," he said. "Information obtained by the House Committee Investigating Un-American Activities [of which Mr. DIES is chairman] indicates an attempt will be made to interrupt it for an undetermined period when it

approaches full volume—perhaps at the very time when the Allies will be needing the shipments most.

"I hope this forecast proves untrue. Perhaps talking about it at this time will put authorities on their guard sufficiently to prevent such a 'fifth column' manifestation."

Then I have pasted here, to come immediately after the article I have just read, a small article reading in part as follows:

ROUNDLY APPLAUDED

The House yesterday gave another evidence of its support for Mr. DIES' investigation when 250 Members listened to him closely for an hour and at the end gave him the unusual tribute of rising to applaud him for a full minute.

I was very, very happy to read that, because I think MARTIN DIES unquestionably is deserving of a tribute from the American people and the everlasting thanks of the great American masses for having done such excellent work in this "fifth column" matter.

In conclusion in regard to the "fifth column," which is the subject of the resolution I have submitted providing for an investigation by a committee of this body, I have here an article entitled "What's Behind the News," which mentions the "fifth column." I recall having read the article in part; but I shall not ask that it go in the RECORD until I have taken my seat, when I can read it in full, to ascertain whether I want it to be embodied in the RECORD in its entirety.

Mr. President, I have now completed my statement in reference to the "fifth column" as it relates to my resolution. I respectfully suggest the absence of a quorum, because now I am going to offer an amendment to the pending bill, upon which I desire to make some observations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Andrews	Danaher	King	Reynolds
Ashurst	Davis	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Donahey	Lee	Schwartz
Barbour	Ellender	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gerry	McCarran	Slattery
Bone	Gibson	McKellar	Smathers
Bridges	Gillette	McNary	Smith
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Stewart
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Burke	Hale	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Pepper	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, a moment ago, when the presiding officer was doing me the honor to listen so attentively—and please believe me I am very grateful for the Chair's great interest—I had before me an article entitled "What's Behind the News." At that time I had not had opportunity to read it very carefully, but having in the meantime, while the roll was being called, read the article, I ask that it be published in the RECORD in connection with my resolution for the appointment of a committee of Senators to investigate the "fifth column."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S BEHIND THE NEWS

(By Ray Tucker)

CHARGES

The files of the Dies committee are jammed with documents from officials and prominent businessmen in the Southwest alleging that thousands of undesirable foreigners have infiltrated the United States because of lax enforcement of the immigration laws on the border. The evidence has shown a steady accumulation and acceleration since disclosure of Hitler's Trojan technique in Norway and other countries.

"Recently," writes a leading lawyer of Albuquerque, N. Mex., in a typical letter, "I happened to be in Juarez, and before crossing back to El Paso the American immigration officer stuck his head in the streetcar door and merely asked all of the passengers if they were American citizens. We all nodded our heads affirmatively, but any type of undesirable who presented a fair appearance could

also have nodded affirmatively, and therefore have gained admittance into the United States." The same sort of casual enforcement is reported to prevail on trains running from Mexico into southern California.

State and Department of Labor officials deny charges that their enforcement agencies are careless, although they have recently notified their border officials to exercise greater vigilance. But Chairman DIES and Representative JOHN J. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico, who has been named chairman of a subcommittee to investigate this problem, will make a personal study of the situation as soon as Congress adjourns.

STRATEGY

Hitler launched his "blitzkrieg" against the low countries at this particular time with at least one eye on the American Presidential election, in the opinion of well-informed Britishers in Washington. It was undoubtedly only one factor in his timing of the grand assault, but it is believed here to be an important consideration.

ELIMINATION OF OPPRESSIVE LABOR PRACTICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1970) to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In reference to the pending issue, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that the clerk read it, and I shall ask for a record vote on it at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert the following on page 20 after line 20:

TITLE III

SEC. 301 (a). After the date of the enactment of this act it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or in the production of goods for such commerce, to have any aliens in his employ to the extent of more than 10 percent of the total number of his employees; and of any aliens so employed preference shall be given to aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, and not more than 10 percent of the total amounts paid by such person to all his employees shall be paid, directly or indirectly, as expenses or salaries to the aliens employed by him. For the purpose of this section, the term "person" includes an individual, partnership, association, corporation, or other business enterprise.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of this section shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

On page 20, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 206" and to insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 302."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina intend what he has just offered as a modification of the pending amendment?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In reference to the proposed amendment, I wish to say that if my amendment should be adopted—and I think it should be adopted, if we are more interested in American citizens than we are in aliens—it would prohibit any employer having more than 10 percent of alien employees. In other words, it would make it mandatory upon the part of American employers to employ American citizens to the extent of 90 percent of all their workers. Under the amendment, only 10 percent of aliens may participate in any work which may be available.

Mr. President, I have taken into consideration those aliens in the United States who have made application for American citizenship. A provision is made for them in the 10-percent exception, for, according to my amendment, preference must be given to aliens who have heretofore made application for naturalization.

In addition to that, in order that the American workingman may be assured of getting his part of the moneys to be expended for services, the amendment requires that 90 percent of all the money paid out by American employers to their employees must be paid to American citizens, and only 10 percent may be paid to aliens who are working in this country today, and are holding down jobs which now should be occupied by American citizens.

Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, I have in mind the making of motion pictures. I am told that in the making of many feature pictures, which are distributed throughout the entire United States from State to State, a foreign

motion-picture actor or actress may on occasion receive more money for the making of one picture than is received by all the other employees who are American citizens—those assisting with the machinery, the electrical appliances, and so forth, all of which labor is necessary and essential to the production of a film. I say that the American people are entitled to this work; that they should be given preference now; and that there should be a law enacted giving them preference.

Some time ago I read an article in the Washington Daily News having particular reference to the migratory problem, an article by Mr. Ludwell Denny, in which he discussed the column of Mrs. Roosevelt, and mentioned the book entitled "Grapes of Wrath," and also the motion picture under the same name. In this article it is stated:

Herbert Hoover yesterday at Stanford University said:

"We should undertake to care for these people not in great camps but by establishing them in 3- to 5-acre homes, with these settlements of small numbers spread throughout the country so they will be accessible to whatever employment there is."

Mr. Hoover, like Mrs. Roosevelt in her column and like thousands of other people in the United States, is interested in providing for American citizens. I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 6, 1940]

MIGRATORY PROBLEM

(By Ludwell Denny)

If enough Congressmen see the Grapes of Wrath film showing here, and if such persons as Eleanor Roosevelt and Herbert Hoover continue talking about the migratory problem, and if the Public Affairs Committee gets wide circulation for its latest exposé, Congress may yet do something for those American refugees.

So far President Roosevelt's Budget blocks even a continuation of the Federal Government's puny efforts. The proposed cut of \$40,000,000 would leave the Farm Security Administration only \$123,000,000. That would provide aid for only a fourth of the 120,000 midwestern and southern farm families who will otherwise join the homeless trek.

The effort is to prevent growth of the migrant army at the source, and then to resettle the present army on small holdings in new opportunity areas.

Two Voorhis bills would amend the social-security law to provide Federal aid to States for care of transients. One would authorize an initial appropriation of \$10,000,000 and encourage reform of State settlement laws. Another would provide \$7,000,000 annually for State medical care of nonresidents.

Herbert Hoover yesterday at Stanford University said:

"We should undertake to care for these people not in great camps but by establishing them in 3- to 5-acre homes, with these settlements of small numbers spread throughout the country so they will be accessible to whatever employment there is."

Mrs. Roosevelt, on an inspection trip of Government and private camps in California, said Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath did not exaggerate conditions. In advocating resettlement, she mentioned the Grand Coulee Dam project in Washington. Officials here hope that 100,000 families may eventually be settled there with Federal help.

But any large-scale help probably will have to wait on a congressional investigation. There is more hope now than 2 weeks ago that the House Rules Committee will approve the Tolan resolution for that purpose. Supported by the entire California delegation, it probably will pass.

There are many reasons why Congress has done so little:

1. When the powerful farm lobby gets its subsidies there is not much left, even in a deficit budget for the landless farmer.

2. The migrants cannot vote, and therefore have no political drag.

3. Many of the Southern and Midwestern States are only too glad to get rid of their dispossessed and surplus families, driven to California and elsewhere.

The study issued today by the Public Affairs Committee, "Adrift on the Land," is by Paul S. Taylor. He is an economics professor at the University of California, member of the California Board of Agriculture, and consulting economist of the Federal Social Security Board.

He differentiates between the Joads and the old-type migration of single men who followed the grain harvests before the day of the combine; and also the one to two million families who now follow the harvests but return to their homes. Neither of those groups is similar to Steinbeck's families, who have been forced from their homes forever.

Among the factors which distinguish the Joad labor conflicts from ordinary farm-labor problems, according to Dr. Taylor, are: Industrialized agriculture, employers' desire for complete control of wages, perishability of crops, lack of status of mobile farm wage

earners, and interstate migration of native Americans driven from their land.

He cites authorities for the prediction that the migrant problem will increase with mechanization of agriculture in the South.

The average migrant earns about \$250 a year. Health conditions are the worst in the country, educational opportunities hardly exist, family life is demoralized, and rights of citizenship are denied. The violation of their civil liberties has been exposed by the La Follette investigating committee.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in particular reference to our national-defense program, I read the following clipping:

7,000 SEEK NAVY JOBS

NEW YORK, May 22.—Naval officials said today that more than 7,000 men have applied for jobs at the Brooklyn Navy Yard as a result of reports that two battleships now under construction, the *Iowa* and the *North Carolina*, would be rushed to completion.

Here is another article which I clipped from one of the local papers, entitled:

One Thousand Job Seekers Turned Away at Navy Yard.

All this goes to prove that thousands upon thousands of American citizens, native-born and naturalized, are seeking work at this time, and cannot find it. I ask that this article be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE THOUSAND JOB SEEKERS TURNED AWAY AT NAVY YARD

A thousand disappointed Washington citizens yesterday discovered that the Washington Navy Yard has no openings yet for apprentices, laborers, and helpers under the expanded national-defense program.

All yesterday morning there was a line of applicants a block long at the local yard, in response to the President's order of the day previous authorizing navy yards to put on two shifts and increase personnel by 15,000 men. Last figure available was that 1,000 applicants had appeared at the local yard yesterday.

They were told no applications were being received for defense-program jobs.

Applications are accepted only when an examination is to be held to qualify eligibles for appointment under Civil Service regulations. None is pending in those three classes of employment.

Machinists are being taken on at this time from a register established last February. However, another machinists' examination has been announced, and applications are being accepted accordingly.

Examination doesn't mean a written test, according to the Navy Yard Labor Board. Applicants are rated on their experience, are examined orally by Civil Service here, and the register set up by the Director of the Fourth Civil Service Area.

One other examination is pending for the local yard—to set up a register for stationary steam engineers. This was closed to applicants yesterday.

Several more will be announced within the next week or two for other jobs.

Navy Department personnel also reports a milder rush of job applicants since President Roosevelt made his expanded-defense speech to Congress last week. Ten, fifteen, or twenty people have applied daily.

However, the Department also takes on employees only through Civil Service registers, and up to this time the expanded-defense program has created no new jobs at headquarters here.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I observed this item in the columns of the press yesterday:

EMPLOYMENT FAILS TO RISE DURING MONTH

Labor Secretary Perkins reported yesterday that nonagricultural employment failed to increase between March 15 and April 15, although there usually is an increase of 240,000.

"Seasonal employment gains in public and private construction and the construction-material industries, in quarrying and metal mining, and in the war-supply and food-manufacturing industries, were offset by reductions in other factory employment, in coal mines, and on railroads," Miss Perkins said.

She reported factory employment declined by 75,000 workers during the 4 weeks. Employment in iron and steel declined 12,600, in auto 10,100, woolen and textile mills 14,300, and in the clothing industry 29,500.

Wholesale firms reported a net decrease of 24,000 workers, while employment on Federal and State public construction increased by 45,000. Retail stores employed 4,200 fewer workers on April 15 than on March 15.

I dislike very much to refer to the distress in this country, but yesterday I clipped from the Washington Daily News the following article:

FIFTH OF POPULATION IN DENVER ON RELIEF

DENVER.—More than 20 percent of Denver's 300,000 residents are receiving public aid of one kind or another, but each month brings a reduction, the city welfare bureau reports.

Bureau officials reported that on April 1 there were 36,387 persons receiving either old-age pensions, direct relief, or dependent children's aid, while 27,006 were supported by W. P. A. employment. Direct relief showed the most marked reduction as compared with April 1939, the Bureau said.

Surely we should not be so derelict in our duty as to permit noncitizen aliens in this country to hold down jobs which belong to American citizens. I say that the time has arrived when we should enact laws making it mandatory upon industry, and the heads and directors thereof, to employ American citizens, to feed their wives and babies, and provide them with clothing and shelter, before they attempt to feed the hordes of aliens in this country today, noncitizens, who are taking the jobs which rightfully belong to American citizens. Therefore, Mr. President, my amendment is offered.

Before me is an article which reads:

WHERE \$18.50 DOES ITS HARDEST WORK

[Photo of farm house]

This is the 6-room house in which Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Saphore live with their 14 children in Carlisle, Pa.

HONORS WON'T FEED FAMILY OF 16—\$18.50 A WEEK DOES—AND STRETCHING FATHER'S PAY KEEPS SAPHORE CLAN BUSY IN A \$5-A-MONTH HOME WHICH LACKS CONVENIENCES, BUT HAS CHEERFULNESS

CARLISLE, March 16.—Being feted by Congressmen, because you support a wife and 14 children on an average wage of \$18.50 a week, is great stuff in its way.

But when the excitement is over and you've been to the National Capital and seen your name in the papers, well, you're right back to stretching that \$18.50—and it's some stretch.

That's what the Daniel W. Saphores were doing when a reporter dropped in on them today—a little more than a week after their splurge in Washington as guests of Congressman JOHN KUNKEL, Pennsylvania Republican.

The Saphores—the children range in age from a few months to 14 years—were crowded into their 6-room unpainted frame house at Churchtown, figuring out how to set aside enough to pay their \$5 monthly rent and how to go on from there.

NO CONVENIENCES IN HOME

Their house has no conveniences, in the modern meaning of the term, and that accounts for the low rent, of course, but it has one thing: A definite air of cheerfulness.

You couldn't say that the Saphores have any fun as far as paid amusement is concerned, like going to the movies. But they're quite a happy brood. Maybe it's work that does it.

For instance, the boys were washing and filling the kerosene lamps. They were bringing in coal for the little range in the kitchen. They helped the girls with the dishes while some of the other girls went about silently dusting and mopping.

Mrs. Saphore—her name is Alice, and she's only 29—says, with a faint smile on her dimpled and youthful face, that the boys also do a lot of the washing. Matter of fact, she opines, they're almost as good around the house as the girls.

You'd think the Saphores would have a budget, but there's no such thing, if you're thinking of a piece of paper with a lot of figures on it. What they have is an all-abiding sense of how far \$18.50 a week will go.

BARGAIN HUNTER

Mrs. Saphore is a champion bargain hunter—even gets milk and bread at a discount. They have meat only about three times a week, for dinner, and once in a while in the form of scrapple for breakfast. But they manage to get plenty of good, plain grub.

With the children pitching in with the housework, Mrs. Saphore finds time to make much of their clothing and even more time to mend it. Hand-me-downs are the rule, and the family outgrows the stuff before it wears it out.

Rent and food are the big items in the budget, and then comes gasoline. Saphore drives to his job in a shoe factory. Clothing and furniture are far down the list and definitely in the if, as, and when category.

If you notice that this story has no interview with the Saphores, you will understand that stretching that \$18.50 is a full-time job. Very little time for talking. The reporter didn't want to interrupt.

I read an article a moment ago from the pen of a gentleman whose name I did not know, addressed to the Public Forum of the New York Herald Tribune, in which he stated that 750,000 boys and girls are graduating annually in the United States from our schools and colleges. He said that only one out of every three would get a job anywhere within the next 3 to 5 years.

I have before me a letter from a young lady by the name of Miss Bettie Morrell, of 9 Stowe Avenue, Baldwin, Long Island, dated March 25, 1940. I recall very vividly having read the letter some time ago, and I clipped it from the newspaper because I thought perhaps the day would come when I could bring to the attention of the Members of this body and the

readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the way the youth of the country feel about Uncle Sam's employment of aliens, providing work for noncitizens, while poor Uncle Sam has been neglecting the forgotten people of America.

The letter is directed to the editor of the Nassau Daily Review-Star, and the writer closes it by saying:

Uncle Sam, you furnish foreigners with jobs, why can't you furnish your own children with jobs? Remember, we grow old, too, and sooner or later, at this rate, we too will become discouraged and lose our youth.

To Uncle Sam and his helpers, please, we beg you, "Give us a chance."

Give the boys and girls of America a chance. Let us see what Miss Morrell further says:

If I only had a chance, I'd be a great singer. If I had a chance, I'd be a writer. If I had a chance, I'd be a doctor. If I had a chance, I'd be another Amelia Earhart.

Five simple words, but they are shouted daily from street corners, homes, and subways. Every place you go, everywhere you turn, youth is shouting, "If I only had a chance."

No one hears them. Why? Because typewriters, bosses' orders, rumble of taxis, and the tooting of trains cover up their cries. If it isn't that, it's because people don't want to hear them. After all, we are just youth.

Every June and January hundreds from all over the country graduate from schools. The ones who can afford it go to college; but the others—yes; the others have to wait for a chance that never comes. They trudge daily the streets of some small town, or leave home to go to New York, where there is supposed to be a chance.

Do you wonder why so many boys stand on street corners all night or gamble away their last cent? Or maybe why so many girls go wrong; girls who steal or leave home? Every one of them takes a chance. No one will give them a chance, so they just make one for themselves.

ENDLESS SEARCH FOR WORK

As they march from one employment office to another, or fill out one application blank after another, they begin to wonder if it really is worth it or not.

Mr. President, these boys and girls are wandering in hopelessness, trudging daily up and down the streets, and over the broad expanses of the land, here and there and everywhere, seeking only a chance and opportunity to work, and they are disgusted because America provides many noncitizens and aliens with jobs but they can find none. In the concluding paragraph of the letter I am now reading the writer pleads with Uncle Sam to provide the boys and girls of America with jobs. Miss Bettee continues:

All the answers from offices or employment bureaus are the same. "Sorry, nothing today," or "I have a position open but I need someone with experience." How can we get experience unless you will give us a chance and let us learn?

Oh yes; I know what you are thinking. You tell us that there are lots of jobs for us. Sure, if your father is influential or has money. Or if you know someone behind the lines who can pull strings for you. But suppose we haven't any of these advantages. Are we supposed to just sit back and wait? We want to be independent—not have to depend on our parents to support us all of our lives. Then again we can lie or play sophisticated and say we are experienced. But if we get caught—another chance we have to take.

Youth today is enthusiastic, filled to the brim with vim and vigor. We have hopes and dreams and we want to start at the beginning so we can work to the top. But it seems every dream we have, someone comes along and sticks a pin into it and all we have left is just the illusion. I want to be a fashion model, but because I haven't the money for training, I have to wait. I haven't experience so no one will bother to teach me. That is the same with other fellows and girls who can't afford to go to college. They want a job so they can save to go later. They know what they are aiming for, where their goal is, but when will they reach it?

PARENTS NOT SYMPATHETIC

We need encouragement to keep our chins firm and our backbone straight—encouragement from people who are supposed to love us, want to help and protect us. These are our parents, but instead they accuse us of laziness and of not wanting to work. They argue with us when we try to tell them the predicament we are faced with—they think it's as easy as picking a cherry off the tree in the backyard. It begins in the morning and ends at night. Don't parents know that we need sympathy at this time? Not that they should feel sorry for us, but enough to give us a feeling of security and a feeling of being needed in this world. We need encouragement, mothers and dads, to look forward to a day when we will be wage earners—to look forward to a tomorrow that may be brighter and have more to offer us.

Again I read the appeal of this fine American girl who seeks only an opportunity to which she is entitled before such

opportunities are provided to noncitizens, to aliens in this country, who are usurping the jobs of the American workmen and the American boys and girls. Miss Morrell concludes:

Uncle Sam, you furnish foreigners with jobs; why can't you furnish your own children with jobs? Remember, we grow old, too, and sooner or later, at this rate, we, too, will become discouraged and lose our youth.

To Uncle Sam and his helpers, please, we beg you, "give us a chance."

Mr. President, I, like many others, am desirous of providing employment first to American citizens. I am desirous of having the legislative body of our Government guarantee employment to our American men and women, boys and girls, by making it mandatory on industrialists, the employers of the country, to employ American men and women, boys and girls, before they employ aliens, and that is why I have offered my amendment.

Mr. President, in order to bring my amendment to the attention of those interested, and in order that we may have a record vote upon it, I shall ask for a record vote, in order that the American people may know where we stand—as to whether we are for the American citizens or whether our interests and sympathies are with non-American citizens—in order that the American people may know whether or not we are going to guarantee employment to them, if employment is to be had.

Mr. President, I ask, and I sincerely hope, that we shall have a record vote on my amendment.

Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum now, so that a vote may be taken on my amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Andrews	Danaher	King	Reynolds
Ashurst	Davis	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Barbour	Ellender	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gerry	McCarran	Slattery
Bone	Gibson	McKellar	Smathers
Bridges	Gillette	McNary	Smith
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Stewart
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Burke	Hale	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Pepper	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have been trying to work out an amendment to the pending amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina. When we had this matter up several days ago and the Senator offered his amendment limiting the employment of aliens to not more than 10 percent, I brought to his attention what seemed to me to be an equitable situation surrounding those who had lately declared their intention to become citizens. I have a feeling that when any alien has come into the United States in good faith and has legally filed his declaration to become a citizen of the United States, and has done all he can to become a citizen and to become identified with this country, he should not be placed on the same basis as an alien who has come into the country without any such intention and who has made no effort to become an American citizen. The Senator has provided in his amendment that of the 10 percent of aliens who may be employed preference shall be given to those who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States; but I do not think that quite reaches what I thought was to be done when the matter was under discussion a few days ago. I still feel that we ought not to put aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States in the same class with aliens who have not done so.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Neither do I.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not believe that merely giving them preference over other aliens, among the 10 percent who may be employed, and classifying them all as aliens is sufficient. I make that statement preliminary to offering an amendment to the amendment which does what I think should be done. I suggest striking out the language:

And of any aliens so employed, preference shall be given to aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States.

And substituting the following:

The word "alien" shall not be construed to include those persons who have legally declared their intention to become citizens of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Just a moment, Mr. President. I desire to be heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would still leave the 10-percent limitation applicable to aliens who have not indicated their intention to become citizens of the United States, and would place in the same category as citizens of the United States those aliens who have formally and legally declared their intention to become citizens, many of whom have done so as soon as they could under the law. It seems to me that that would be an act of fairness and justice. Those who have done all they could to become citizens, who have done so as quickly as possible, and who are not citizens simply because the necessary time has not elapsed, should not be placed in the same category with those who are here and who have made no effort to become citizens, many of whom do not intend to become citizens.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I desire to say to the Senator that, in the first place, I think I have been extremely generous to the noncitizens because in my amendment I make a reservation for them to the extent of 10 percent. Frankly, Mr. President, I think that if there are any jobs in the United States anywhere they should go to citizens of the United States, but, being sympathetic as I am, I have set aside 10 percent for noncitizens. When the American people are insistent in their request that jobs be given to them, I say that if there are any jobs in this country they ought to be given to Americans before they are given to foreigners, before they are given to noncitizens, before they are given to aliens. All in the world I am pleading for today is for the American laboring man. I want him to have the jobs, for, I repeat, if there are any jobs in this country they ought to go to American men so as to enable them to provide maintenance for themselves and their wives and their children. I think I have been extremely liberal in setting aside in this amendment 10 percent to be participated in by noncitizens.

Under what obligation are we to supply employment and support for people in this country who are not citizens? I contend that it is our duty to provide jobs for American citizens and not to provide jobs for foreigners. In this amendment, I will say to our distinguished leader I have given only 90 percent of the jobs to citizens of the United States, and I am perfectly willing to give 10 percent to foreigners. There is no other country in the world that would even think of giving 10 percent of the available work to foreigners. Let an American go to France or to England or to any other country in the world and try to get a job, or try to get relief or try to get help; he would be kicked out or put in jail. This is the only country in the world that gives such consideration to noncitizens.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no dispute between the Senator and me as to his last statement; we ought to prefer American citizens for the jobs which are available; but I cannot help but have a feeling that people who have been driven out of their native countries and are trying to find a haven somewhere in the world where they can even preserve their lives, and who have come here, have filed their papers, and indicated that as soon as they could they wanted to become citizens of the United States and to become identified with our country, ought to be given the en-

couragement which I think we all want to hold out to them, that they are not to be treated as if they were aliens, although technically and legally they are aliens until they complete the process of becoming American citizens.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator and I are in perfect agreement to the effect that at least 9 out of every 10 of the jobs which are available should go to either native-born or naturalized American citizens.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no quarrel with the Senator on that point, but I think, for instance, we ought not to discriminate as between an alien who has come here recently and who is doing his best to become a citizen and the alien who came here a little earlier and has been able to complete his citizenship. In other words, we ought not technically to take advantage of those who are trying as fast as they can to become citizens by setting them off on an island to themselves, and saying that those who came here a year or a year and 6 months ago and who have completed their citizenship shall be put in one category and those who came later and have not been able to finish their citizenship, but are pursuing it just as rapidly as they can, and have taken all the steps they could take up to now, shall be in another category. I feel that they ought to be treated alike.

Mr. REYNOLDS. But a man who has completed his citizenship application is a citizen of the United States; there is no distinction between a naturalized citizen and a native-born citizen.

Mr. BARKLEY. He may not, however, be any more sincerely in sympathy with our institutions than some of those who have not completed their citizenship but are doing all they can to complete it.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. My inquiry is really directed to the Senator from North Carolina. In the western section of the country during periods of prosperity, which we have had, it has been difficult to secure among American citizens all the labor that has been needed. I was wondering if the Senator would consider an amendment to the effect that more than 10 percent of aliens could be employed if citizens were not available. I will give the particular instance I have in mind. In the beet fields in the West there is a great seasonal demand for labor; there have been times when American citizens were all at work, and could not be obtained, and it has then been necessary to go into northern Mexico and bring in seasonal workers, simply because there was no American labor available. If in periods of prosperity—not now—it should become necessary to allow a greater percentage of noncitizens to be employed, I wonder if the Senator would consider a limitation of 10 percent only if American labor is available? Such an exemption from the limits of the Senator's amendment would not be for the benefit of the alien, but for the benefit of American industry.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very happy to have that suggestion, but I wish to say to the Senator that I was somewhat surprised at his statement, for while he was talking my mind reverted to an article which I read to the Senate 2 or 3 years ago, when the Senator's distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] was Governor of that State, and so many Mexican laborers came into the State; there was such an influx of Mexican laborers taking away from Americans jobs which he said they ought to have that the junior Senator from Colorado, Governor JOHNSON, called the militia to keep them out of the State.

Mr. ADAMS. That was not in a period of prosperity. I am simply saying that there are times of great employment in the Western States when it is difficult to get American labor for that kind of work.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In other words, if there are any Americans to take the jobs, give them the preference.

Mr. ADAMS. We do not want to shut down the beet fields.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator for his suggestion. Therefore I will be very happy to agree

that the amendment provide that so long as there is a job in the United States that can be filled by an American, it must mandatorily be filled by an American; and if it cannot be filled by an American, it may be filled by an alien. Let us make it a hundred percent for the American laboring man; and if there are not a sufficient number of American laboring men who are unemployed to fill the jobs which are offered, then I am perfectly willing and anxious to give them to aliens who have made application for citizenship, or those, for that matter, who have not made application.

So I thank the Senator immensely; his suggestion makes my amendment much stronger; and I am perfectly willing to agree that, first, Americans must be called upon to the last man to fill the jobs, and if they cannot be filled by Americans, then others may be employed. I thank the Senator for the suggestion. It is a great contribution to the American people.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, an amendment cannot be offered without submitting it in the formal way. I still hope the Senator from North Carolina will be willing to agree to the suggestion which I have offered to him with respect to aliens who are now attempting to become citizens and who have legally filed their declarations to become citizens, and not put them in the same class as aliens who have not done so.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am not doing that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is not, but he says that among the 10 percent of aliens preference shall be given—

Mr. REYNOLDS. To those who have filed application for citizenship.

Mr. BARKLEY. But that does not seem to me to be quite the way to treat the alien who has made an effort in a legal way to declare his intention to become a citizen.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It gives him preference.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to say to the Senator from North Carolina that I hope he will not accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky. In my opinion, to do so would nullify the entire amendment. As I understand the position of the Senator from Kentucky, all that it would be necessary for an alien to do would be to file a declaration of intention to become an American citizen, and he would thereby be placed absolutely on the same footing as an American citizen even though he did not pursue his declaration.

In hearings before the committees it has developed that in a great many instances declarations of intention to become citizens have been filed for various reasons by aliens, but have not been completed. As I recall, Mr. Harry Bridges has filed declarations but never completed them in the manner required by the immigration laws. I understand that under the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky, all that would be necessary for an alien to do would be to file a declaration; then he would be on the same footing as an American citizen, although he might not pursue his declaration any further. I can see some merit to the position that an alien who has already filed a declaration on the day of the passage of this act might be put on the same footing as an American citizen, but certainly if we should adopt the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina would have no practical effect.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It would absolutely destroy the intention of the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not put such an interpretation on it, and, while I am not going to be contentious about the matter, I think if we are to allow aliens to come into the United States we ought to encourage them to become citizens, we ought to encourage them to have a stake in our country. If we are not going to do that we ought not to let them come in at all.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think the Senator is right; we ought not to let them come in at all until every unemployed American citizen shall be given employment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am in favor of some law that will provide that after an alien has been in this country a certain length of time, if he shall not have sought to become an American citizen he shall be subject to deportation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am absolutely 100 percent with the Senator from Kentucky on that point.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think he ought to be required either to become a citizen or to go back where he came from; but there are in this country many worthy persons who have been driven from their homes by the lash of an intruder, as we know. We have not let down our bars to those persons.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield in a moment. We have not amended our laws in that respect; but many of those who have come in under the quotas are persons of high character, persons of good intentions, and desire to become affiliated with the American Republic. I want to encourage that; and it is only because I do not want to place upon those persons who want to become citizens the ban that they have to be put on the same basis as those who are here and who have no intention to become citizens of the United States that I offer the amendment.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, may I have the floor for just a minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield first to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thought I had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to know when he got the floor from me. I yielded to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is mistaken. The Senator from Kentucky obtained the floor to speak, and to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh! I beg the pardon of the Chair. Then will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina. It does not make any difference who has the floor. I am satisfied that between us we can keep it indefinitely.

Mr. REYNOLDS. If I should agree to the Senator's suggestion, which would be in the form of an amendment to an amendment, the Senator's amendment to my amendment would place on an equal basis with the American citizen, whether native-born or foreign-born, the alien who had merely made application for citizenship; and it would ruin my amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the Senator be willing to agree to an amendment of the nature suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that a limitation as to the time of filing the application for citizenship should be included in the amendment?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I could not agree to that. I am sorry. I hope I am not disagreeable.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky now yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. There is an assumption in this argument that is erroneous. Most of the persons coming into this country today, and for the past several months, are not coming under the quotas. They are coming as nonquota immigrants. They are coming as visitors, and most of them are being employed as they get here. Certain organizations are putting them to work. The amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, as I understand, would prevent these visitors, who presumably have no intention of becoming anything more than visitors, from staying here permanently and going on the pay rolls available to our people.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that the suggestion I make has no application to such visitors. It applies only to those who have come here legally, and have

made legal declaration that they want to become citizens of the United States, which certainly would not cover visitors who are here only temporarily.

Mr. HOLMAN. The pretext is that they are here temporarily, but really they are here permanently.

Mr. BARKLEY. They would have to have filed their papers making application to become citizens before they could come under the language I have suggested.

Mr. WAGNER. And show that they were legally here.

Mr. BARKLEY. And they would have to show that they were legally here.

I am not meticulous about this matter. I am not going to quarrel with the Senate if it does not want to adopt the suggestion that by this language we ought to encourage those who have come here in good faith to become citizens of our country, who have made an effort to become citizens of our country, who are identified with our population and are mixing with it, and as soon as they can will become citizens of the United States; but in the interest of our own country, in the interest of good faith, and in the interest of dealing with these persons according to their intention to become a part of our people, it seems to me we ought not to put them in the same category either with the visitors who are coming in and getting jobs without any intention to become citizens or with those who have been here for years and have made no effort to become citizens of the United States.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, what I am about to say does not go to the question of the wisdom or unwisdom of the particular amendment which is pending. I am in sympathy with the proposal of the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky. I think it would very much improve the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, and I hope the Senate will adopt it. But I should like to call attention to a case which was decided by the United States Supreme Court, the case of *Truax against Raich*, arising under the fourteenth amendment.

In 1914 the Legislature of the State of Arizona passed a bill, and it became a law, providing that no employer of labor could employ more than 20 percent of aliens; in other words, that 80 percent of his employees had to be American citizens and qualified electors. That act was contested by an employer in the State of Arizona, and it went all the way to the United States Supreme Court. I am about to read from volume 239 of the United States Reports, the case appearing on page 33. There the United States Supreme Court declared that law unconstitutional. Senators will remember that the protection of the fourteenth amendment extends to "any person." The United States Supreme Court said that included all inhabitants of the States, whether they were citizens or aliens, and that the fourteenth amendment, requiring due process and the equal protection of the laws for all persons, included all inhabitants, whether they were aliens or citizens. The Court invalidated the act upon the ground that it denied equal protection to aliens who had legally come to our country and were legally here.

Of course, Congress could prevent any alien from coming to this country. We have absolute control over immigration, and we could provide that no one could come to this country. But since we have lawfully admitted these persons to the country, they are entitled, as the Court said, to the equal protection of the laws of the several States.

I may read just a paragraph from the decision:

It is sought to justify this act as an exercise of the power of the State to make reasonable classifications in legislation to promote the health, safety, morals, and welfare of those within its jurisdiction.

By the way, Mr. Justice Hughes—the present Chief Justice—wrote this opinion:

But this admitted authority, with the broad range of legislative discretion that it implies, does not go so far as to make it possible for the State to deny to lawful inhabitants, because of their race or nationality, the ordinary means of a livelihood. It requires no argument to show that the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the community is of the very essence of the personal freedom and opportunity that it was the purpose of the amendment to secure.

That decision deals with the Fourteenth Amendment, which, of course, has application only to the laws of States. My own view is, however, that the United States Supreme Court would hold that a Federal law in similar terms violates the due process guarantee of the fifth amendment, which likewise extends to any person, regardless of citizenship, and likewise protects against arbitrary restraint the right to work for a livelihood. I am simply raising this question so that the Senate may have at least the benefit of this decision. It may be that notwithstanding this decision we will regard this amendment as a wise regulation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that the Senate may have an opportunity to pass on this matter, I offer the following amendment to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina:

Strike out the following language after the word "employees" in the fifth line of the amendment:

and of any aliens so employed preference shall be given to aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States.

Insert a period after the word "employees," and the following:

The word "alien" shall not be construed to include persons who have legally entered the United States and who, not less than 6 months prior to any application for employment, have legally declared their intention to become citizens of the United States.

That would obviate the possibility of anybody rushing into the country and declaring his intention to become a citizen in order to get a job, because he must have declared his intention to become a citizen not less than 6 months prior to any application.

I hope the Senator from North Carolina will accept that amendment, because I think it is fair, and I think it protects what he is trying to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the amendment suggested by the Senator from Kentucky would place an alien who has made application for American citizenship on the same basis with an American citizen. There would be absolutely no difference. If the amendment which the Senator has suggested should be adopted by this body, it would simply mean that any alien in the United States who made application for American citizenship would be placed on the same basis as an American citizen.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; he must have made his application for citizenship not less than 6 months prior to his application for a job.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Very well. According to the Senator's amendment, any alien in the United States who makes application for American citizenship 6 months prior to the time he makes application for a job is placed on absolutely the same basis as an American citizen. What I am trying to do is to provide that employers of labor in the United States shall give the jobs to poor people in the United States, who are starving in every State in the Union. I am opposed to giving any jobs to any aliens so long as men and women in this country who are citizens of the United States are starving.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize the earnestness and the sincerity of the Senator from North Carolina, but it seems to me we have to adopt a policy either of welcoming those who are here who desire to become citizens of our country and accept the responsibilities of citizenship, or say to them that we do not want them to become citizens, and therefore that we will not let them come into the United States under any conditions. I want the people who come into our country with the intention in good faith of becoming American citizens, to feel that they are welcome to become American citizens.

Mr. REYNOLDS. They are.

Mr. BARKLEY. If they are not welcome to become American citizens, we should stop them from coming in,

because we do not want to increase the number of aliens in this country who do not desire to become citizens.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question. Under his proposal, an alien who had been here for 20 years, let us say, and who never made application for citizenship, could make his application for citizenship now, and 6 months hereafter he would have all the benefits of the act.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Absolutely.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think that would do.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no law in this country which requires a man who has been here for 20 years to file an application for citizenship. I would vote for a law that would require him within 2 years to make application for citizenship—

Mr. REYNOLDS. Absolutely; and so would I.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or not be permitted to enjoy the privileges and immunities inherent in American citizenship. But citizens of other countries have come here, and there is no law which requires them to file applications for citizenship. I imagine that those who have been here 10 or 20 years have some sort of employment already, although I do not know. At least they have not become public charges.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I disagree with the Senator in that respect. I read a statement in a newspaper a few days ago that 42,000 aliens in the city of New York were on relief.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are on relief, but relief is a different matter from W. P. A. employment.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Relief is a local matter, which in that case is being administered by the city authorities in New York.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; but they are public charges.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. They are public charges, limited, from the standpoint of the expenditures, to the taxpayers of the metropolis of New York.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would not the Senator rather encourage those people to become citizens of the United States than compel them or encourage them to remain outside the category of citizens of the United States, and have them taken care of as aliens by local governments?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say no, and I will tell the Senator why. What good as a citizen of the United States is a man who has been here for 20 years and has to be forced to become a citizen of the United States?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not defending that sort of thing; that is why I am in favor of some law which would compel them, after they have been here a certain length of time, to become citizens of the United States.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senate understands this matter, and I do not wish to consume any more time on it. I am willing to have a vote.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, there is something I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues before the vote is taken, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Chavez	Hayden	Minton
Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Herring	Murray
Ashurst	Clark, Mo.	Hill	Neely
Bailey	Connally	Holman	Norris
Barbour	Danaher	Hughes	Nye
Barkley	Davis	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Downey	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Bone	Ellender	King	Pepper
Bridges	George	La Follette	Pittman
Brown	Gerry	Lee	Radcliffe
Bulow	Gibson	Lucas	Reynolds
Burke	Gillette	Lundeen	Russell
Byrd	Guffey	McCarran	Schwartz
Byrnes	Gurney	McKellar	Sheppard
Capper	Hale	McNary	Shipstead
Caraway	Harrison	Maloney	Slatery
Chandler	Hatch	Miller	Smathers

Smith
Stewart
Thomas, Idaho

Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Tydings

Vandenberg
Van Nuys
Wagner

Walsh
Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am loath to discuss this amendment. It is known, of course, that those who have worked on the pending bill have spent several years in preparing and attempting to frame a bill in conformity with all possible practices, with the best information available from Government and other sources. Now an amendment is offered, and it is about that amendment that I wish briefly to speak.

The amendment takes all persons in the United States and divides them into two classes, and attempts to give employment preferences to one of those two classes. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] suggests an amendment to the amendment which would make the privilege of employment somewhat wider by including those who had applied for citizenship within the class of citizens.

Mr. President, the difficulty with the amendment is that, while its objective is exceedingly desirable, those who are proposing it forget that our country is one of law, and that persons in the United States are treated as persons, and have rights because they are persons. There are persons in the United States who are citizens, and they have certain rights because they are citizens. There are persons in the United States who are nationals of the United States, but not citizens of the United States. There are persons in the United States who probably applied for citizenship many years ago, who cannot become citizens because of the blood which flows in their veins. There are persons in the United States who are wives or husbands of citizens of the United States. There are citizens of the United States who are completely dependent upon noncitizens of the United States for their livelihood. Since the enactment of the Cable law, citizenship has not been conferred on those persons who marry citizens of the United States.

Now we have before us an amendment which affects a very complicated law. No one dares offhand say what is the right of a citizen, or a person married to a citizen, because the citizenship law is so complicated that we have to consider each case upon its individual merits.

Mr. President, the injustices which may be done to worthy persons in the United States by such an act appall one who has undertaken to study the operation of citizenship law.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] called attention to one of the decisions of the Supreme Court dealing with a State act which attempted to do what is now proposed in the Senate. I agree with the Senator from New York that the fourteenth amendment is a limitation upon the action of States. But in other provisions of the Constitution the Federal Government is limited in its actions with respect to persons.

If we attempt to inject into an already complicated and complex situation, in connection with which case after case respecting individuals has gone through the various courts of our country, a further complication we will merely add to the difficulties facing our courts in regard to the rights of persons, whether citizens or aliens.

I call attention to the fact that under the Senator's amendment a foreigner who for one reason or another has been in our country for years, even a person who is married to a citizen of the United States, may be deprived of a livelihood and his dependents may be put upon relief because of the manner in which the amendment would make a classification between citizens and noncitizens.

I may also call attention to the fact that when our country found itself in an emergency, when it instituted the draft law, when it caused registration for the draft to be made, we did not draw the line then between citizen and alien, but every alien was drafted or was subject to call. Aliens have obligations to the United States, and as a result of those obligations they are given certain rights.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LEE. I believe the record also shows that during the World War, according to General Crowder, 20,000 aliens crossed the border and are today carried on the draft books as deserters.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I know of some such cases. I know also that when the war was over certain persons who served with distinction and with honor in the Army asked for citizenship. As a result of their service it was granted. But that was stopped by law. It does not make any difference if 20,000 unworthy persons took advantage of the situation and became deserters. There were some worthy aliens, and in this instance I am speaking for the worthy ones.

I should like the law to do what our Constitution does, and treat men and women as persons, and not merely to classify them into two classes when, in reality, there are many classes to be considered in dealing with the people of the United States.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am not a constitutional lawyer; I have never posed as one; I have never contended I was one; but I wish to say that if the Constitution of the United States as it is constructed now is not sufficient to protect American citizens and give them preference over foreigners, noncitizens and aliens, the Constitution of the United States should be changed.

It was my opinion that the Constitution of the United States was created for the purpose of protecting the people of the United States. It has never been my opinion that the Constitution was drafted by our forefathers for the purpose of protecting the nationals of other countries of the world. To the contrary, as I have stated, and repeat, I am of the opinion that our Constitution was designed and drafted with a view to provide protection for the people living under that Constitution as citizens of the United States, and if our Constitution now is not sufficient to provide protection and preference for the people who as citizens of the United States are living under the Constitution, it should be changed, and changed now, for if we continue to permit the influx of aliens into the United States as they are coming in now and as they have been coming in and as they will come in, we shall have almost as many aliens in the country as we have American citizens.

I wish to say that I am opposed to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague and friend, the beloved leader of the majority, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], because I am firmly of the opinion that if his amendment should be adopted it would simply kill the amendment I have offered. If his amendment should be adopted it would put every alien in the United States who makes application for American citizenship on the same basis as the American. That is my opinion about the matter.

Mr. President, I should like to have a record vote on this question.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have had written in pencil the amendment which I suggested to the Senator, and which he indicated might be agreeable to him, which I should like to have read by the clerk, so we can see whether the Senator is willing to accept it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be delighted to have it read. My recollection of the little conversation we had a few moments ago is that the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Colorado to my amendment would provide all the jobs for Americans. That is what I want.

Mr. ADAMS. It does not go that far.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as requested.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 5 of the pending amendment, after the words "his employees" it is proposed to insert:

Provided citizens willing and qualified to do such work or perform such services are available for such employment in or near the locality where such work is to be done.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I cannot agree to that, because in Colorado they might be looking for certain labor, but laborers would migrate from one section to the other.

Mr. ADAMS. If there were potatoes to be dug in Colorado, and there was a surplus of labor in Maine, would the Senator

from North Carolina insist that labor be transported from Maine, when labor was available perhaps nearer at hand?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, I would; because I would rather transport labor from Maine to Colorado than to bring laborers from Europe to Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. The aliens we are speaking of live nearby.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I could not accept that amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Then I shall submit it at the proper time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Since I have the floor, someone interested in the matter we now have before us has handed me another clipping, by the Associated Press, published in the Washington Star of today. It is as follows:

MANY PLANTS READY FOR DRIVE TO BAR ALIEN WORKERS—NEW POSITIONS WILL BE GIVEN ONLY TO UNITED STATES CITIZENS

NEW YORK, May 24.—Many industrial plants in line for Government orders under the expanded defense program probably will begin tightening requirements for employment of United States citizens only, informed sources said today.

Some aircraft and shipbuilding plants advertising for skilled workers specify citizens only are wanted, in accordance with Army and naval contractual rules, it was pointed out.

The General Motors Corporation, a spokesman said, last year laid down a policy of restricting manufacturing forces to citizens in hiring new workers and requiring aliens on the pay rolls to take out citizenship papers.

The personnel officer of a leading aircraft accessory manufacturer said the increased armament program logically would widen the industrial areas where citizenship requirements would apply in employment policies.

A steel executive said national-defense needs naturally would lead to generally increased vigilance at factories and mills directly or indirectly supplying armament materials.

Wright Aeronautical Corporation, Paterson, N. J., one of the leading aircraft engine producers, reported it wanted citizens only and was solving its man-power problem for faster production partly by training courses.

Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., Kearny, N. J., subsidiary of United States Steel Corporation, likewise specified "citizens only" in sending out calls for skilled workers. Its working force of more than 7,000 was described as made up entirely of citizens.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hesitate to enter into a legal discussion with such an eminent lawyer as the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], but I cannot let pass unchallenged the inference, if I understood his remarks correctly—and I unfortunately came in as he concluded reading from the opinion—that the sovereign power of the Federal Government of the United States is limited in the respect pointed out in the opinion from which he read, which, as I understood it, applied to some State law which undertook to discriminate between American citizens and those who were not American citizens.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. I pointed out in my remarks that the case involved the fourteenth amendment; that the fourteenth amendment extends to "any person"; that the United States Supreme Court said that the word "person" included all inhabitants of the States, whether citizens or aliens; and that the fourteenth amendment required the equal protection of the laws for all persons, including all inhabitants, whether aliens or citizens.

If I may further interrupt the Senator, I will say that of course Congress has absolute control over the question as to who shall come into this country or whether we shall admit anyone into this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is undoubtedly true.

Mr. WAGNER. Having passed a statute which permitted aliens to enter the country, then at least under the fourteenth amendment they are entitled to the equal protection of the laws. I think it would logically follow that the right to make a livelihood would also be an incident to being an inhabitant of the United States. However, I did make that limitation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should not attempt to discuss that question with the Senator. From time to time a number of States have passed laws for the registration

of aliens, and all such laws have been invalidated by the Supreme Court of the United States, which has held that under the fourteenth amendment the States have no right to pass laws requiring the registration of aliens within the boundaries of the States. This rule does not relate to or restrict Federal power. In the case of *Fong Yue Ting v. United States* (149 U. S. 698) the Supreme Court specifically held that the Congress of the United States has a right to legislate with reference to aliens and to discriminate between the rights of aliens and the rights of citizens of the United States.

Mr. WAGNER. I agree to that.

Mr. RUSSELL. In that case the Supreme Court held—merely restating previous decisions of the Court, which have been followed in subsequent cases—that Congress has the right to provide a system of registration and identification of any class of aliens within the country, and to take all proper means to carry out that system. The decision is interesting. It is a very long decision, and I shall not undertake to read it all. However, certain portions of the decision are very significant. I wish to read merely three or four paragraphs:

The right to exclude or to expel all aliens, or any class of aliens, absolutely or upon certain conditions, in war or in peace, being an inherent and inalienable right of every sovereign and independent nation, essential to its safety, its independence, and its welfare, the question now before the Court is whether the manner in which Congress has exercised this right in sections 6 and 7 of the act of 1892 is consistent with the Constitution.

The United States are a sovereign and independent nation, and are vested by the Constitution with the entire control of international relations, and with all the powers of Government necessary to maintain that control and to make it effective. The only government of this country, which other nations recognize or treat with, is the government of the Union; and the only American flag known throughout the world is the flag of the United States.

The Constitution of the United States speaks with no uncertain sound upon this subject. That instrument, established by the people of the United States as the fundamental law of the land, has conferred upon the President the executive power; has made him the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy; has authorized him, by and with the consent of the Senate, to make treaties, and to appoint ambassadors, public ministers, and consuls; and has made it his duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. The Constitution has granted to Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, including the entrance of ships, the importation of goods, and the bringing of persons into the ports of the United States; to establish a uniform rule of naturalization; to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations; to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution these powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. And the several States are expressly forbidden to enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; to grant letters of marque and reprisal; to enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power; or to engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Furthermore, from the beginning our Constitution has made a distinction between aliens and citizens. The Constitution provides, for instance, that a Member of the House of Representatives must necessarily have been a citizen of the United States for 7 years; that a Member of the Senate must necessarily have been a citizen for a term of 9 years; and that the President must be a native-born citizen. As we all know, anyone who is not a native-born citizen may not become President of the United States. Therefore, if the Senator will permit me to refer to the statement made by my distinguished friend from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who seemed to think that the Constitution did not make these distinctions, I wish to say that from the beginning these distinctions have always been made as between citizens and aliens. The Constitution clothes the Federal Government with perfect and complete power to deal with the question as the Congress and the President may determine.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah and Mr. MINTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I did not say that the Constitution did not make such distinctions. I said that the amendment which has been offered really makes two distinctions between aliens and citizens, and that many other classifications and complexities enter into the question. I did not hint that we do not have the right to pass this kind of a law.

Mr. McKELLAR. I misunderstood the Senator. I am glad I misunderstood him.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We are adding more complexity and difficulty to what is already an extremely complex situation.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President—

Mr. RUSSELL. I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. MINTON. As I understand the decision cited by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], it held to be unconstitutional the act of a State legislature which discriminated against an alien, on the basis that the fourteenth amendment applied to persons as well as citizens. However, it must be remembered—and I think the Senator from Georgia will agree with me—that the fourteenth amendment is a limitation on the action of the States, and not on the Federal Government. So the case cited by the Senator from New York is clearly distinguished from the position which the Senator from Georgia now takes.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I made my position as clear as I could, and if the Senator from Indiana did not understand it, I am sorry I have not the words properly to express what is in my mind.

Mr. MINTON. I did not hear the Senator's explanation. I was called out of the Chamber. He cited the case, and then I was called out of the Chamber. If he made an explanation I did not hear it. I beg the Senator's pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will proceed in order. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. WAGNER. I understood the Senator from Georgia had yielded to me.

Mr. MINTON. The fourteenth amendment is a limitation upon the authority of the States.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. That is exactly what I said in my statement when I referred to the case; and I repeated it when I asked the Senator from Georgia to yield to me. I have made no statement contrary to what the Senator has just now read from the Federal case.

Mr. RUSSELL. The only reason I call attention to the decision is because I was in the same situation as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON]. I also did not hear the Senator from New York distinguish between the cases. I did not know that he had read the decision and then said it was not applicable to the pending amendment.

Mr. MINTON. I do not see the point of the case, if the Senator from New York read it and then said it did not apply. If he made that explanation, and the case was perfectly clear, it had no application.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I did read the case, and I stated that it involved an interpretation of the fourteenth amendment. However, I said that the reasoning in that case may be persuasive in the case of a law which has universal application, although that is something which we cannot predict.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the vote. There is a long line of decisions to the effect that there is a difference between the right of the Congress of the United States to deal with this question and the power of the States to legislate with reference thereto, due to the limitation contained in the fourteenth amendment.

I wish to read two more paragraphs from the decision to which I have referred, and then I shall conclude:

Congress, having the right, as it may see fit, to expel aliens of a particular class, or to permit them to remain, has undoubtedly the right to provide a system of registration and identification of the members of that class within the country, and to take all proper means to carry out the system which it provides.

It is no new thing for the lawmaking power, acting either through treaties made by the President and Senate, or by the more common method of acts of Congress, to submit the decision of questions, not necessarily of judicial cognizance, either to the final determination of executive officers, or to the decision of such officers in the first instance, with such opportunity for judicial review of their action as Congress may see fit to authorize or permit.

Mr. President, I shall not tax the patience of the Senate by reading other cases. In my opinion, there is no question on earth as to the power of the Congress of the United States to legislate in this matter if it so desires.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In the interest of American citizens.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have listened attentively to this debate. It seems to me to be much ado about something which may be inconsequential.

The amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina proceeds upon the sound assumption that until an alien becomes a citizen through naturalization he is still an alien; and the Senator has very generously made a distinction between those who have indicated their desire to become citizens and those who have not. He puts them categorically or fundamentally in the same class. They are aliens, but one is alien to a greater degree than another. Those who have signified their desire to become citizens are given preference in the 10-percent exemption over those who have not.

It is useless to quibble or to attempt to dodge an issue. When I was chairman of the Immigration Committee I took occasion to have the statisticians determine how many adult male aliens were coming into the country, and I was astonished to find that the number of such adult male aliens was as great as the number of male children being born to native parents.

I may say in passing that that was such an astonishing revelation to me that, in collaboration with others, I obtained the passage of the first restrictive immigration law. The President vetoed it on the ground that it was not in accord with the American spirit to deny an immigrant access to this country because of his lack of an education. That particular President had devoted his life to the field of education. What was his real reason for vetoing, on that particular ground, the immigration bill I am unable to say. I desire, however, to take this occasion to state that I believe the time has come in our American life, considering the demoralization of the moral, spiritual, and mental attitude of the world, to keep our sickness to ourselves and shut the door until we have either rotted or recovered. It is useless for us to attempt to treat a disease and at the same time to allow an infestation to pour in while we are treating it. I think the time has come when, in justice to ourselves—charity begins at home—we ought to shut the door until we can, as I say, rot as Americans or recover as Americans.

There is not a Senator present today who can state how many aliens, foreign-born adults, have poured into this country. We are the object of the greed and aspiration of every other nation on earth, and it is natural for their nationals to come to this country where we are so lax in our laws in reference to sabotage. There are many things we are winking at because we are afraid we will lose votes. That is the weakness of a democracy. An unworthy man will aspire to office and do unworthy things in order to get votes to attain office. Until we begin to take stock of what is undermining us and our efforts to equip ourselves to protect not only the material wealth of this country but the precious form of our government, we shall not be pursuing the proper course. There are termites within as well as outside influences that have weakened us to such a point that the present America is not the America that formulated the Constitution. No. But we have got to begin now to protect ourselves.

Consider our condition. We have almost reached the limit of our credit; we are naked and defenseless before the in-

ventive genius of others; the ocean has shrunk to such a point that it is hardly a barrier; instruments of destruction have so multiplied and developed that the forms that once made heroes have gone and tanks and airplanes have taken their place.

With forty-odd billion dollars spent—\$7,000,000,000 of it for defense—we have to start anew and tax the American people beyond the power of meeting the demand so as to defend the longest seacoast of any nation on earth. Where are the men whom we trusted to keep us advised—our Diplomatic Service, our Intelligence Bureaus? We are faced with the possibility—and I hope it is only a possibility—of being plunged into a war for our existence as a government, undefended, with an Army absolutely inadequate to meet an invasion, with no tanks, and no airplanes adequate to our defense. According to the best information I have been able to obtain, it will be 2 years before we can be equipped to meet an invasion from one side or perhaps from both sides, the Pacific and the Atlantic.

The pending amendment is only a feeble effort to encourage the American to be an American. We are reaching the point where we are drawing in and drawing in and having class legislation, until a real, free American citizen does not know whether he is in America or not.

This bill provides that an industry may not protect itself against sabotage, against the unlawful invasion of those who would destroy its plant. We here are seriously considering a bill which, if it had been presented 20 years ago, we would have felt like indicting its author. A man walked up to me not very long ago, slapped me on the back, and said, "Ed, why do you not get on the band wagon?" I replied, "I am going to hell fast enough by walking; I do not need to accelerate my speed." [Laughter.]

I know it is useless for me to stand on the floor of the Senate and beg that we go back to the landmarks which have indicated the road that has led us to our present greatness. They have changed; we have turned off, and no man knows the untried sea on which we are being forced to embark.

Legislation is introduced here every day which every real American citizen is convinced is sinister, or he is doubtful as to what it means. The underlying effort seems to be to get votes, regardless of what becomes of our splendid form of government and what the effect may be on the ultimate triumph of American principles over the principles sought to be maintained by other governments of the world. Now free men in a free country, given the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, without being dogged and harassed and tormented by bureaus and commissions and "isms," have to render up their substance to promote that which they know to be destructive of their Government. I may be pardoned for referring to my long service in this body, but I have seen the gradual encroachments on our form of government, backed up by the almost irresistible desire to warm these seats at any cost. I have read with profound interest the history of the United States Senate. It was at one time a glorious honor to be a Member of the Senate. God knows where we are now. Few speeches that ring with real Americanism are heard; the drift of many speeches is, "What will benefit me and my section and promote my selfish interests?" That is more or less true of every Senate that has convened, but infinitely less was it true in the days gone by than it is today.

I know we had an awful monetary crisis that frightened men. We have been so accustomed to be free and independent, and make our own property, and enjoy it when we made it, that when war and catastrophe began to shake our faith, then came those who catered to the demoralization. It is useless for us to sit down and remain silent, because it happened to be beneficial to me and my business. I say it was a glorious success temporarily to you; but in the coming years the very thing that you praised and exalted will become the weapon that will destroy you.

I had made up my mind that during the continuation of this session I was going to keep my mouth shut. Surely I

am not alone. I may have too much temerity, but I am going to voice my opposition to the sinister influence that is undermining our Government, throwing the doors open to the riffraff of the Old World, and claiming that we are the melting pot. They have melted the pot; that is what is the matter. Instead of melting them into good American citizens; they have melted us into the riffraff of the Old World; and when we have a committee that searches out in honesty those who are not in accord with the glorious and precious principles of our Government, its members are besmirched; the committee is condemned and brought into disrepute.

I hold no brief for the Dies committee, but I glory in what they have accomplished and that they had the power honestly and fearlessly to dig up and expose, with a view to deporting those who are undermining our Government; and we have in this body men who either do not understand our form of government or despise it.

Take the bill we are considering today, and read it in the light of real Americanism. I was walking down the street yesterday afternoon—I ought to have been here, but I was serving the country just as well while walking about on the streets as I would have here—and I saw before the Press Club Cafeteria a Negro walking back and forth, picketing it, carrying a banner saying, "This cafeteria is unfair," libeling a business that I have not heard has been indicted. I went around on another street, and before a tailoring establishment I saw another brother in black carrying a banner stating that the tailors were unjust. If we would do our duty, we would make such persons bring charges under the law, and not permit them to carry libelous banners before what we consider worthy institutions. We just have not the grit to do it.

I am not condemning the Senate of the United States. They will take care of that themselves. Think of standing here day after day and week after week and debating legislative proposals that everyone of us in his heart knows are a disgrace to a democratic form of government. "Equal rights to all, and special privileges to none," is "as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal"; and it is not in the Senate alone—no. It extends from one end of our organized government to the other.

I hate to repeat; but I have said that in the awful times of the struggle to establish this Government we had patriots pure and undefiled, 100-percent pure, tried in the fire of adversity, with the history of unnumbered years as the background of their suffering. They were p-a-t-r-i-o-t-s. Now we have unnumbered patriots, but we spell the word differently. It is spelled p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-s. Oh, we have millions of them! I have heard men, with holy looks on their faces and rotten hearts, singing praises that the Constitution and our dual form of government are obsolete. The principles set down in our Constitution and in the immortal Bill of Rights had they been written during the period when the Bible and the old sayings were written would have been canonized as the direct revelation of God, as much so as the 10 moral Commandments.

I am only one voice, but, if Senators will excuse this personal allusion, I thank God that for 32 years in this body I have kept the faith. I have endeavored, regardless of whether I wanted a bill passed or not, to speak the truth as I saw it, and to fulfill my obligation and my oath to uphold the immortal Constitution against all enemies, both foreign and domestic. The real enemy we have to meet and face, and the only one I have ever seen menacing this Government, is right here, a domestic enemy. No foreign government has ever really menaced our form of government; but right here we are so familiar with our freedom that we are selling it and are not aware of it. [Manifestations of applause in the gallery.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the gallery must preserve order.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, it gives me a feeling of sadness to have lived long enough to see these changes come about, and, fortunately or unfortunately, to have been a Member of this body during the time they occurred. Every

other Senator took the same oath that I took to uphold the Constitution against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, and yet some of them have come right down here and joined the enemy. I do not say they did it consciously; but our Constitution got so greatly in the way of those who did not believe in it, or believed in a different interpretation than what the language said, that we were requested to give them a new set of judges who would interpret the Constitution according to the "modern" viewpoint.

I do not know what the coming years may bring. It may be that desertion of the Constitution, and a government of men and not of laws, may be the best, but not for me. I would rather know specifically, and by the written word, the limitations under which I am entitled to live.

Bankrupt morally, spiritually, and financially!

Mr. President, I apologize to this gathering, not to myself, for having said what I have said, and at the proper time I shall be specific, and show the horrible departure we have made from the real principles of our Government.

God knows another revolution may be necessary at some time to reestablish the sovereignty of the individual, his right to earn his own living, and to enjoy the living he earns, the right to be a free man in an erstwhile free country, and have no inhibitions or prohibitions against his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I shall take occasion at some time, perhaps, to define what happiness is. It is not to be found in this country now.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment to limit the number of aliens who may be employed to 10 percent. I believe this is a good time for us to increase the premium on citizenship.

I have heard pleas for sympathy and have seen people shed crocodile tears for aliens, for alien uncles, alien cousins, alien aunts, alien mothers, and other alien relatives, and I think it is about time to shed some tears over American citizens, particularly at this time. Aliens who are here and have an opportunity to become citizens, and, by their actions, show that they do not want to become citizens do not love this country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the amendment provides that one-tenth of all employees may be aliens. I note the presence of the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma, and also the Senator from Georgia, whether either of them knows of any other nation on earth which permits aliens to form as much as 10 percent of all employees.

Mr. LEE. I do not.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. BONE. In that connection, I should like to ask the Senator whether he can advise us, or if any other Member of the Senate can advise us, what percentage of the total population is in this alien class, so that we may have some idea of the connection between the number of aliens and the number of employables; at least some ratio between the two.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. No one could answer that question, for the reason that we do not know how many aliens there are in the country, and we will never know until we have a registration of aliens.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Tennessee was kind enough to mention my name in connection with his question to the Senator from Oklahoma. I am not familiar with the laws of all the countries of the world with reference to aliens, but I have had occasion to investigate the rules and regulations in force in most of the principal countries of the world.

There can be no question that this Nation is more generous with its alien residents than is any other country about which I know anything. Most of the European countries, for some time before the outbreak of the war, had the most rigid and drastic regulations as to the types of work which could be performed by aliens within their borders. They required registration, and licensing in some instances, and certificates from their labor departments that no native was able to perform the work, before any alien could be employed. It was carried to such an extent in some countries that they would not even receive American moving pictures, or they could not be shown, unless the American moving-picture producer would employ a certain number of citizens of that country in making the pictures.

Certainly there is no other country which has been so lax in keeping track of aliens as has ours. Even the South American countries, which have been supposed to be rather careless in their handling of aliens, have registration laws for aliens. Ours is the only country of which I know which invites people in, to remain as long as they please, under the limitations of the immigration law, and has no requirements whatever as to registration, and which does not differentiate between the foreigner and the citizen.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me to ask another question?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Georgia states that he knows of no country so liberal as is the United States now in the treatment of aliens. Does the Senator know of any other nation on the face of the earth which would be nearly so liberal as we would be, even if the pending amendment were on the statute books?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not, and while I am not familiar with the statutes of all countries, I doubt whether any other country, wherever situated, has a statute which would permit 10 percent of those who are not its citizens to be engaged in industry within its borders.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senators for their contributions. I sat in the Dies committee on several occasions and heard some of the aliens testify, and noted their demeanor. In their brazen arrogance they showed that they held the American people in utter contempt, or, as they would put it, they despised them for their stupidity. Sometimes I wonder where tolerance ends and stupidity begins, and particularly in times such as these when agents of foreign governments come in to honeycomb and undermine what they cannot directly overthrow. A far greater percentage of aliens—because it is through the alien infiltration that foreign governments are able to get their agents in—than of citizens is disloyal.

I wish to read from a late edition of the Evening Star about one of these aliens. Here in black headlines we find:

British jail Rintelen in big spy round-up.

That is the same name, and if I am not mistaken, it is the same man who, when four or five "brown shirts" entered the capitol of Austria and foully and in a cowardly manner murdered little Dolfuss, the little iron man of that nation, while eight other Nazis held guns at the head of the broadcaster at the national broadcasting station and forced him to announce to the people of that country that the Dolfuss government had fallen, and Rintelen had been placed in charge. Let me read the article:

Former German espionage head taken in London.
Forty "fifth column" suspects arrested in relentless clean-up.

Those were the headings.

LONDON, May 24.—Capt. Franz von Rintelen, noted for German espionage activities during the World War, and in recent years a resident of England—

He was in England, but was not a citizen—

a resident of England, was detained today in England's drive against "fifth column" activities.

In the World War, von Rintelen was one of the chief German spies in the United States, then came to England in 1936 as a conscientious objector.

When we were engaged in the World War 20,000 of these so-called conscientious objectors, according to General Crowder's records, crossed the border, and are carried on the books today as deserters.

Mr. President, I believe that now is the time when we should take at least this mild and moderate step toward making our Government secure from within, while we are spending billions of the taxpayers' money to make it secure from without—now, when all over the country we are holding celebrations to show that citizenship means something.

I saw a moving picture of a very impressive celebration, where aliens who wanted to be citizens, who appreciated our form of government, who considered it an honor to be citizens of the United States, received their final papers. The picture showed them as they marched along. Each of them had in one hand his citizenship papers; in the other, the flag of his former country. As they passed by the chairman they exchanged the flags of their former countries for the flag of this country. That was an impressive occasion.

On May 5 there was, in Oklahoma, a gigantic demonstration of first citizenship. In a stadium thousands came to receive their papers. Those boys and girls who had just become of age made something of the fact that they had become citizens.

I believe that now is a good time to adopt the very modest amendment providing for a limitation of 10 percent, and even that, I believe, is too high a ratio. Why should we finance our own destruction? I think this is a good time to eliminate from the Government pay rolls all those whose first allegiance is to some other flag than that of the United States. I refer to Communists and aliens whose first loyalty is not to the Stars and Stripes.

When Paul was about to be scourged by the Roman centurion he straightened to his full height and said, "Scourgest thou a Roman citizen?" And the centurion dropped the cat-o'-nine-tails as though it were hot, because it meant something to be a citizen of Rome. I should like to see a greater premium placed on being a citizen of the United States.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to interrogate the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] for my own information. I came into the Chamber at about the time the Senator from Kentucky was offering an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina. I understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina provides that not more than 10 percent of the aliens in the United States may be employed in industry.

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; it provides that not more than 10 percent of aliens can be employed by employers of industry in this country under this bill. In other words, 9 out of 10 persons employed by industry under this bill must be Americans, and only 1 out of 10 may be an alien.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator would not consider that language to make it mandatory on employers to employ at least 1 alien out of every 10 employees, would he?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No.

Mr. STEWART. How are we to determine what constitutes 10 percent of the aliens of the United States?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We do not do that. We take into consideration the number of aliens on the pay roll.

Mr. STEWART. On the pay roll of each individual industry?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. It is not 10 percent of the total number of aliens in the United States. The language means 10 percent of those employed by and on the pay roll of industry, that is industry engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. STEWART. Yes, of course. And the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, as I understand, defines an alien as any person who has not taken out his first citizenship papers within 6 months before applying for a position?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not less than 6 months prior.

Mr. STEWART. Not less than 6 months prior to the time he makes his application?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I merely wish to make an observation or two in this connection. I have not participated in any of the debates which have taken place in this body since I have been here. As a matter of fact I imagine that only a half a dozen times in the two or three sessions I have served here, have I even been on my feet to undertake to say a few feeble words. But I have gone along with other Members of the Senate who are interested in immigration laws. One reason is because I happen to be a member of the Immigration Committee.

Last year I was a member of a subcommittee which considered a number of alien bills introduced by various Members of the Senate. We made a sort of collective study of several of those bills for some 2 or 3 weeks. We interrogated a great many witnesses, and undertook to establish the truth of a great many statements which had been made. Among other things we undertook to ascertain the very matter the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] inquired about a few moments ago, namely, how many aliens there are in the United States.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, may I intrude again at this point?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I should like to have the able Senator from Tennessee explain to me whether there was any question in connection with the recent taking of the census, the answers to which would give the Government any indication of the actual number of aliens in the United States, and if that was not in the list of questions—I do not recall that it was—I am wondering why it was not.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, if the Senator will let me reach that point in my own way, which I shall in a moment, I shall make a statement about it.

To resume where I left off: Among other things, we undertook to ascertain at that time how many aliens there were in the country. The hearings were printed and are available. If my memory is correct, there were 3,800,000 aliens known to be in the United States at the time; I mean the Commissioner of Immigration knew of that many being here. Of course, there was proof that there were perhaps a great many others here who had entered the United States unlawfully, and whose places of residence were not known, and who were not counted in the number of nearly 4,000,000 who were here. I think the aggregate number of unnaturalized persons known to be in the United States was about 3,800,000.

In that investigation we also undertook to ascertain how many aliens were employed in various industries throughout the country. I do not mean that we inquired from all the industries, but we had testimony before the committee, or evidence of some character, as to the number of aliens employed in some of the industries of the United States. We sent telegrams to some of the larger manufacturing concerns and large mercantile establishments throughout the country. I shall not undertake to state just what those telegrams revealed, because I do not recall definitely.

A number of bills, as I have said, were before that committee for consideration. Some required the fingerprinting of aliens. Some would absolutely close the doors to all immigration from any countries other than those in the Western Hemisphere. Others of somewhat drastic nature likewise were considered.

It was apparent that a great many of these bills were too drastic to suit the temper of the Congress at that time. So, to make a rather long story short, I will say to the Senator from Washington, I prepared and introduced a bill which contains some ideas that were original with me—at least at that time I thought they were—and other ideas which were suggested as an outgrowth of the hearings before the subcommittee which was appointed by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Immigration Committee.

The bill which I introduced, and which is now on the calendar, known as S. 2830, provided that at the time the census for 1940 was taken the census takers should in-

quire and ascertain certain facts from the alien population of the United States. Among other things they should be required to obtain, of course, the name and address, the place of birth, the date and port of entry into this country of the alien, and whether or not the alien had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen. The bill would require the Bureau of the Census then to transmit that information to the Secretary of Labor.

It was argued then, and has been known and argued a great many times since, that census information is private, that is, that it should not be made known to the general public, because of the intimate nature of the questions which are asked by census takers. That objection was advanced, among others, to the bill.

Therefore, it was provided in the bill that the Bureau of the Census should transmit this information to the Secretary of Labor, who at that time, of course, had charge of immigration and of immigrants. But the information so obtained was not to go further. It was simply to go to the Secretary of Labor.

Among other things, the bill provided for an alien registration board, to be composed of five members, one selected from the Department of Justice by the Attorney General, one selected from the Department of Labor by the Secretary of Labor, one selected from the Post Office Department by the Postmaster General, one selected from the Department of Commerce by the Secretary of Commerce, and one selected from the State Department by the Secretary of State. Those five persons were to comprise what was known as a permanent alien registration board.

The bill required that the aliens in this country should go to the nearest post office and register with the postmaster upon a blank prepared by the registration board for that purpose. In registering he was required to give his name and address, and the same information he gave to the census taker. He was further required, in the event he changed his address, to report that fact to the same postmaster with whom he registered.

The bill would have accomplished two things. It is now last year's model; it is out of date, because the census takers have combed the country. Had the bill passed, we should have had the information which the Senator from Washington wanted a moment ago, as to how many aliens are in the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill referred to by the Senator from Tennessee might not be applicable today, and it might not be feasible to pass the identical bill; but I cannot refrain from expressing my firm conviction that we shall not have taken complete steps to defend this country until we shall have passed some legislation which will require the registration of all aliens within our borders. I feel sure that the Committee on Immigration, which has had before it the bill on which the Senator from Tennessee worked so assiduously and so well, will report other legislation to the Senate before the Congress adjourns, because certainly we will not have any adequate means of national defense unless the Congress shall enact laws which will permit us to deal with potential enemies within the country.

I feel that the President's Executive order transferring the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization to the Department of Justice is one of the most constructive steps ever taken to enable us to prepare to defend this Republic from any enemies which may assail it. We should enact a law which will help the Department of Justice keep constant check on all aliens.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I confess that I am at a loss to understand why anyone should consider information as to the number of human beings belonging in a certain category in this country to be of such a confidential and highly personal

nature as to constitute information which should not be revealed to the American people.

If it were made evident that there are 5,000,000 aliens in the United States, that is a fact which does not affect the individual, but certainly it has some bearing on the questions we are compelled to meet. Since the matter of citizenship is a Federal matter—because admission to citizenship is regulated by Federal statute—it seems to me that instead of taking a census it would be entirely within the scope of our power to require every employer in the country to insist, as a condition precedent to the employment of any man or woman, that he or she should state affirmatively, in such form as to constitute a permanent record, whether or not such person is an alien. That fact could do no one any harm.

If this matter is a serious one, the Congress of the United States certainly is entitled to the information. Furnishing the information could be made a prerequisite to holding a position. If I were an alien I probably should not object to that fact being known.

If we are to legislate intelligently upon a question which requires some understanding of the number of human beings we are dealing with, it seems to me that ground-work information is vital. To secure it in somewhat the manner I have indicated seems to me to be entirely just and proper. I cannot think of any impropriety in that sort of approach. I certainly should not want to harm any human being; but, God knows in these times the most accurate information obtainable on any subject which may be controversial, but may be very vital to the country, is essential to a proper understanding of the problems which confront us.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator.

As I have said, the bill is now last year's model, because it required the census takers, in taking the 1940 census, to obtain certain information to which I have referred. Of course, that cannot be done now, because the work of the census takers is completed. It will be my purpose to undertake to make such changes or amendments in the bill as to make it suitable today. I want to cooperate, and will cooperate, with other Senators who are interested in the same things.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the committee's examination into the facts concerning aliens was the annual number who seek to become citizens by naturalization ascertained? If so, can the Senator state what the number is?

Mr. STEWART. I think it was ascertained; but I have not the printed hearings before me and my memory is not accurate in that respect. If I am not mistaken, the number was approximately 200,000. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] may remember better than I do. There is evidence in the hearings to that effect, but I do not recall the figures.

Mr. McKELLAR. Two hundred thousand out of a total of five million?

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator mean the annual number who seek to become citizens?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. I think that was the figure. However, I am stating it from memory, and perhaps should not undertake to quote any figure, because my memory is not accurate.

I undertook to bring the bill up a number of times during the session last year, and I met with considerable opposition from some of the departments which were not in sympathy with it, for reasons which occasionally appeared to me to be, after a manner of speaking, perhaps sound; but some of the objections with which I was confronted in an effort to bring up the bill were rather surprising to me. I was amazed to find that some persons did not want to have aliens embarrassed by the asking of embarrassing questions when the census takers made their rounds. Others were opposed to the bill of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], which provided for fingerprinting, because they said that would be embarrassing to some of the splendid aliens in this country. I think school children are fingerprinted in the

Senator's State of North Carolina. I imagine it would not be embarrassing to children to be fingerprinted. It probably would be a good thing if such a law were in force in this country applying to everybody—citizens as well as aliens.

Such objections were made. I remember that on two or three different occasions I tried to call up the bill when bills on the calendar were being considered by unanimous consent. Objections were made, and it was impossible to have the bill considered. I knew that if it were not passed at the last session, it would not be worth while so far as any activities with respect to the Census Bureau were concerned.

I think we have reached the time when everybody appreciates the fact that we ought to know definitely how many foreigners, aliens, "fifth columnists," or whatever one chooses to call them, are in this country. I think it is important that we know it, and I think it is quite possible that if we do not know it we may experience very serious grief within the not-distant future.

In the light of the activities on the war fronts in recent months, and especially within recent weeks, which have been such as to fire the imagination of men, I do not believe it is an extravagant statement for me to make that I have not the slightest doubt that the green eyes of the dictators, now red with blood, have looked greedily across the Atlantic, and probably across the Pacific, and, in their minds' eyes, at least, they have divided the Western Hemisphere to suit their greedy purposes. I hope to God that from this time on the American people will assert a strong method of dealing with aliens and handling their affairs. I hope they will use strong methods, and deal with them in such a manner that they will know that the American people still believe in democracy and in the tenets of the Christian religion, and are opposed to the bloody sacrifice of innocent human beings.

Of course, we know that a democracy is an easy-going kind of government. It is an ideal government under which to live so long as peace reigns. The dictators undertake to say that democracy is a failure. It is not a failure except in one respect, and that is in performing acts and declarations of war. Those things come from dictators; and, of course, when war begins even a democracy must necessarily assume the form of a dictatorship for the purpose of carrying on the war.

Mr. President, I have already spoken longer than I intended. Without taking any further time, let me say that I hope before the present session of Congress is concluded a bill somewhat like the one about which I have been speaking with respect to aliens will be enacted. I think it is extremely important. I am very deeply and earnestly serious about this matter. I think it is important that we know where each and every single solitary alien is, what his business is, and everything that is to be known about him. We must exercise control over his activities. To this end I think this Congress will not hesitate to pass such legislation as is necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot obtain a vote on the bill, or on the pending amendment, today.

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 241, now in the hands of the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McKELLAR. May the resolution be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the title of the resolution.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 241) authorizing the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the administration of public lands.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from Tennessee now wish that I make a further statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on March 9, 1940, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments, and from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an additional amendment, so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the purchase, withdrawal, and allocation of lands and the administration and use thereof by or on behalf of the Federal Government or any agency thereof; and also is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the filming of motion or sound pictures on areas (1) under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and (2) any other matter with respect to the filming of motion or sound pictures on land belonging to the United States which the committee may deem it appropriate to investigate.

The committee shall report to the Senate the results of its investigation at the earliest practicable date, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-sixth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, was the resolution unanimously reported by the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the report was unanimous. Does the Senator refer to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I refer to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. McCARRAN. So far as I know, the report of that committee was unanimous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committees.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read:

Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the administration and use of public lands.

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain statements, which, in my opinion, are very eloquent and moving, as to what the foreign policy of the country should be at this time. One of the statements is by William Allen White, a great American.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida seems to have a very large sheaf of papers before him. Let me inquire of the Senator if he has ascertained whether or not the matter comes under the rule as to the length of statements to be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there are several communications. One of them is the statement to which I have referred. There is also a group of about six or eight letters from different parts of the country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not intend to object, although I say that the insertion of purely propaganda matter in the RECORD at this time is rather contrary to the general policy of the Congress.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Florida whether or not the writers of the letters urge the United States to declare war on Germany and send our Army and fleet over there.

Mr. PEPPER. No.

Mr. BONE. A great many gentlemen are suggesting that we do so; and I am wondering if Senators, by indirection, are going to urge the Congress of the United States to declare war immediately on Germany.

Mr. PEPPER. No; the writers of these letters do not propose that course. The statements express characteristically, in my opinion, the sentiment of various segments of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matters referred to may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SARASOTA PASS BRIDGE, FLORIDA

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ANDREWS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 7615, Calendar No. 1655. It is a bill merely authorizing the construction of a bridge across Sarasota Pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the bill (H. R. 7615) authorizing the Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across Sarasota Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Pass", to insert "and across Longboat Pass, connecting up the south end of Anna Maria Key with the north end of Longboat Key", and at the end of the bill to insert an additional section, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Sarasota Pass, and across Longboat Pass, connecting up the south end of Anna Maria Key with the north end of Longboat Key, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in the county of Manatee, State of Florida, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, all rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches.

SEC. 3. The said Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of tolls so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. After the completion of said bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Florida, any public agency, or political subdivision thereof, within or adjoining which any part of the bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation or expropriation, in accordance with the laws of such State governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of 20 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include goodwill, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion costs, not to exceed 10 percent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interest in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 5. If such bridge shall be taken over or acquired by the State or public agencies or political subdivisions thereof, or by either of them, as provided in section 4 of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of tolls shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, or to amortize the bonds or other securities issued for that purpose with reasonable financing costs, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and

operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 6. At any time after 25 years from the date such bridge shall have been completed, if the tolls from such bridge have produced sufficient revenue to amortize the bonds and other securities issued in connection with the construction and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches with reasonable interest and financing costs, and if such bridge shall not have been taken over or acquired by the State of Florida or by any political subdivision or public agency thereof under section 4 of this act, then all the right, title, and interest of the said Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real estate necessary therefor, shall be turned over to the State of Florida, upon proper demand. Such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated by the State of Florida or by any political subdivision or public agency thereof free of tolls.

Sec. 7. The Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, shall within 90 days after the completion of such bridge file with the Secretary of War and with the highway department of such State a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and upon request of the highway department of such State shall, at any time within 3 years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the cost alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge; for the purpose of such investigation the said Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, shall make available all records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 4 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

Sec. 8. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act prior to acquirement of such rights, powers, and privileges by the State of Florida or by any political subdivision or public agency thereof pursuant to section 4 or section 6 of this act is hereby granted to the Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure, or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

Sec. 9. The Bradenton Co. shall furnish the Secretary of War with a certified copy of its charter and any amendments thereto evidencing proof that it is a corporation organized, among other things, for the promotion and organization of toll bridges, toll-bridge districts, bridge authorities, and for harbor authorities, each and any of which shall be municipal in kind and nature, and from any or either of which this company shall receive no promotional profit, and further, shall receive no other profit, other than in direct proportion to such investment or investments as this company may make in any or either of such enterprises.

Sec. 10. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Sec. 11. The word "bridge" where it appears in this act, may be construed either in the singular or plural so as to apply to either or both of such bridges.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act authorizing the Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across Sarasota Pass, and across Longboat Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida."

ACQUISITION OF LAND AT KEY WEST, FLA.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 9140, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire land at Key West, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill at this time?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, how much is involved in the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. It relates to 62 acres of land which the Government already is leasing, and a proposition is pending to purchase it. The Government is now paying \$20,000 a year on a lease which expires June 1. The land is now offered to the Federal Government for \$125,000, and if it is purchased the last year's payment will be waived. It is property which it is now necessary for the Government to use, and no doubt it will have to continue to use it.

Mr. WILEY. Has the bill the unanimous approval of the committee?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes; the committees of both House and Senate voted unanimously on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it recommended by the Department?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes; it is recommended by the Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, 62 acres of land, more or less, in the city of Key West, Fla., fronting on Palm Avenue on the south and the Gulf of Mexico on the north, having a frontage on Palm Avenue of approximately 1,790.83 feet and being approximately 1,525.55 feet deep, for the development and expansion of the Naval Air Station, Key West, Fla.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not to exceed \$125,000 to effectuate the purposes of this act.

ACCEPTANCE OF REAL ESTATE FROM CITY OF MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 7543, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept real estate granted to the United States by the city of Miami, Fla., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, how much money is involved in this bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. One dollar.

Mr. WILEY. Very well.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to accept on behalf of the United States the real estate granted to the United States by the city of Miami, Fla., in manner provided by and in accordance with provisions of Resolution No. 15635, adopted by the Commission of the City of Miami, Fla., on September 20, 1939, as amended by Resolution No. 16087, adopted by the Commission of the City of Miami, Fla., on April 5, 1940.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. I wish to ask the leader whether it is his purpose to move that the Senate adjourn over until Monday or to hold a session tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. I intend to move that the Senate take a recess until Monday.

Mr. LEE. I was hoping to be able to bring before the Senate the bill to draft the use of capital in case of war. I have no objection, of course, to a recess to Monday, but if we take a recess and fail to utilize the time, and then all at once we decide to adjourn for the summer, it will shut off the consideration of that measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that of course I have no desire to shut off consideration of his bill. I think we ought to pass, as rapidly as possible, all of the program of national defense. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has charge of the naval-expansion bill, which he is ready to have the Senate take up. The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] has the military bill, which he is ready to have the Senate consider. We have not concluded the consideration of the unfinished business. We all know how difficult it is to do anything here on Saturday, with Members busy in their offices, and it seemed to me it was not worth while to try to hold a session tomorrow.

The Senator, of course, understands the situation which confronts us. When his bill is taken up, as he of course knows, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has been instructed by the Committee on Finance to move to have the bill referred to the Finance Committee; so it may not take long to dispose of the bill if that should be done. I have no desire to postpone the consideration of

the Senator's bill under the circumstances, but I feel that we must dispose of urgent national-defense measures as soon as possible, so that we may go ahead with the relief bill, which probably will be here by the middle of the week.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield—

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. LEE. Of course, even if the decision were left to me, I would not ask that either one of the bills enlarging the Navy or the Army be delayed for the bill to which I refer; but it is of great importance at the present time to consider some method of financing war. We have a plan for mobilizing men and a plan for mobilizing industry, and yet no plan for mobilizing finances, the sinews of war. So I hope the Senator will help me get that bill before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator knows my position on the question of constitutional priority with respect to the consideration of revenue bills, and while the Senator and I may disagree as to whether his bill is a revenue bill—

Mr. LEE. It does not provide for any taxes.

Mr. BARKLEY. It provides for raising money, and to all intents and purposes it is a revenue bill; and even if we were to pass a revenue bill of that sort and send it to the House of Representatives, under the circumstances they probably would decline to receive it, and would return it to us. So, in view of all that, I think the motion that will be made to refer the bill to the Finance Committee will not be improper; and even when it is referred to the Finance Committee, according to my opinion, it cannot be considered there until the House takes some action which will justify the Senate in going ahead with it.

Mr. LEE. That might be an appropriate argument on the question of referring the bill, but what I want now is a chance to get the bill before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot say to the Senator now when it can be taken up, because I do not know how long the consideration of the pending bill will last, and I do not know how long the consideration of the other bills which are on our doorstep will last. But I will cooperate with the Senator in getting the bill up so that it may be disposed of.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Kentucky has already anticipated part of what I was about to suggest. It will be recalled that we passed the Townsend silver bill, which went to the House, and next Monday the House will send that bill back to the Senate on the ground that it is a revenue bill, and would have to originate in the House. It is entirely probable that the bill of the Senator from Oklahoma will be so regarded by the House, even if the Senate should pass it.

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the Committee on Finance, as he knows as a member of the committee, has over a period of several years had hearings, and has prepared a war-profits bill. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is a distinguished member of the committee, and he will bear me witness that we have now already drafted a comprehensive, scientifically drawn bill, brought up to the moment, so far as the taxing practices of the Nation are concerned.

The reason why we have not been able to get that bill up is, of course, because it is a revenue bill, and until the House sends over to the Senate some kind of a revenue bill to which that bill can be attached as an amendment or a rider, we cannot make any progress. Of course, it is only applicable in time of war. The bill of the Senator from Oklahoma is probably applicable only in time of war.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LEE. The bill referred to by the Senator from Texas is a pure and simple tax bill, a revenue bill, and the two bills are in nowise inconsistent one with the other. The bill to which I referred deals only with the purchase of bonds, and a systematic method of borrowing money. It does not have

a tax in it anywhere. The Senator's bill deals only with taxing the profits resulting from war with respect to commerce and industry. We can recover such profits as result from war in the field of commerce or industry by taxing, but we cannot touch the profits which result from war in the field of finance, because such profits are tax exempt, both interest and principal. The measure affects an entirely different field, and is in nowise inconsistent with the Senator's bill, which I intend to support on the floor and with my vote, and I believe we should give consideration to it at an early date.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma that, no matter what the guise under which money is raised, either for war or peace purposes, whether we raise it by what we call a tax, or whether we raise it by borrowing money, or issuing bonds, the measure by which it is raised is a revenue bill, and must originate in the House of Representatives.

Mr. LEE. I will abide by the decision of the Senate. All I am asking is a chance to have the decision.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma reveals clearly that his bill is a revenue bill, because he says we can only levy taxes on financial operations.

Mr. LEE. It does not levy taxes at all.

Mr. CONNALLY. It provides for the Government getting money.

Mr. LEE. It provides for borrowing it.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is a revenue bill, whether it says, "Well, I am going to tax you," or "I am going to take it away from you." It is the same proposition; it is a revenue bill. I hope the Senator will bear these things in mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. To show how scrupulously the House regards its privilege in the matter of revenue-raising measures, the Townsend bill, to which the Senator from Texas referred a moment ago, primarily repealed the power of the Government to purchase foreign silver, but inasmuch as there is a tax of 50 percent on the profits derived from dealings in silver, which that bill repeals, incidentally, the House is sending the bill back to the Senate on the ground that it is a revenue bill, which must originate in the House, even when a tax is repealed. The Constitution provides that bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, but even when revenue is reduced, the House interprets the Constitutional provision to apply, and to give them the right to originate bills which deal with the raising of money, whether we are reducing it or increasing it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator, I know, will recall, as a Member of the House and also as a Member of the Senate, that all bills merely providing for the issuance of bonds are regarded as revenue measures and have to be initiated in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURKE and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BURKE. I defer to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. To illustrate the principle involved in the matter, let me say as to the measure which the Senator from Texas is sponsoring that it is a variation of an original bill reported by the old Munitions Committee. However, we first had it referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, without trying to put it on the calendar, and then, recognizing that it was a revenue-raising measure, it was referred to the Committee on Finance, where it was considered by a subcommittee headed by the Senator from

Texas, and that subcommittee reported a substitute for it, which has now been introduced as a bill by the Senator from Texas himself.

Let me say that, so far as I am concerned, I am not for the bill introduced by the Senator from Texas, and propose to vote against it in the Finance Committee, unless the substitute which has been introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Washington and some 48 other Senators is voted down, in which case I intend to vote for it. But it does seem to me there can be no controversy or question that the bill of the Senator from Oklahoma is necessarily a revenue-raising measure. The only way in which we would have constitutional authority to make forced loans, which is what the Senator's bill amounts to, is under the taxing power. The Congress has no power to go out and confiscate property. The only theory under which we would have authority to make forced loans would be under the taxing power, and therefore clearly within the jurisdiction, in the Senate, of the Finance Committee, and, as between the two Houses, it must necessarily originate in the House of Representatives.

It seems to me the Senator from Oklahoma might save some time now in the consideration of his bill if he would ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance, to be considered in connection with the bill of the Senator from Texas and the bill of the Senator from Washington, which are already pending before that committee.

Let me say, if the Senator from Kentucky will permit me one more word, that I am very strongly of the opinion that Congress should not adjourn without taking very definite steps to see that not only in the event of war vast swollen fortunes may not be created as a result of the war, but that as a preliminary stage to the war, when a great program of preparedness is being set up, in a national emergency, there should not be permitted inflation in values and swollen fortunes arising as a result of our putting ourselves in a state of preparedness.

I am very much in sympathy with the purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma, as I am with that of the Senator from Texas, but I think the Senator's bill is a revenue-raising measure and should go to the Committee on Finance of this body; and even then, after the Committee on Finance has considered it, it cannot be considered in this body until the House sends over some revenue measure in connection with which it can be properly considered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Missouri in his statement. The only service the Finance Committee could render in connection with a bill of this sort referred to it would be in the saving of time by making preliminary studies and investigations and formulating measures, so that if and when the House did send a measure to the Senate, we could be prepared to act on it.

Now I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, in the absence of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], I think attention should be called to the fact that before some of us can permit any other measures, other than defense measures, to be taken up for consideration by the Senate, we are under obligation, by unanimous vote of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, to call up for consideration the so-called Walter-Logan bill, which has already passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote and has been on the Calendar of the Senate for more than a year. While the Senator from Utah and the other Members of the subcommittee in charge of the bill have not been willing to make any move while defense measures were ready for consideration, as soon as there is any lapse in the presentation of such measures, we propose to make a determined effort to make the Logan-Walter bill the unfinished business.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LEE. I wish to discuss the question of reference of the bill. We could consider that now, but I understand the Senator desires that the Senate take a recess. The question

is debatable, and I wish to debate it. The Military Affairs Committee has under consideration a bill to draft the services of men. One could argue that such a measure should go to the Committee on Education and Labor, on the basis of the argument now advanced that the bill to draft the services of money should be referred to the Committee on Finance. I wish to debate the matter and will proceed now, if the Senator is willing.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would be more appropriate to proceed and debate that subject when the Senator gets his bill before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. LEE. That is all I am asking. A similar bill has been on the calendar for 2 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, we are always glad to hear the Senator at any time on any subject, but it would be more to the point if the Senator were to debate the bill when it comes up for consideration.

Mr. LEE. A similar bill was on the calendar in the previous session of Congress. The bill is now on the calendar. I do not believe I am asking too much when I ask for an opportunity to bring it up for consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree that the Senator is not asking too much.

INFORMATION AS TO NUMBER OF ALIENS EMPLOYED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I propose and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 273), as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that each executive department, independent establishment, and other agency in the executive branch of the Government shall furnish to the Senate immediately full and complete information with respect to the number of aliens employed by such department, establishment, or agency, or compensated in whole or in part from Federal funds appropriated for such department, establishment, or agency, and such information shall include, among other things, statements with respect to the compensation being paid to each such alien, the type of services he is performing, and the length of time he has been employed in any capacity by any agency of the Government.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, in view of the fact—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the resolution should go over.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in view of the fact—

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not think any resolution ought to be acted upon at this late hour, and I cannot agree that it be considered now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over under the rule.

DEFINING CERTAIN MINING PRACTICES

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, on April 1, 1940, the House passed H. R. 8285, a very short bill of only 10 lines, dealing exclusively with the question of patents and unfair trade practices with respect to patents. I gather that it was considered by the Committee on Mines and Mining in the House and probably was merely referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining of the Senate without a realization that it dealt exclusively with patents.

The bill seems to be open to some rather serious objections. The Department of Commerce apparently has not been asked for its views on the bill, and I am informed that neither the Tariff Commission nor the Federal Trade Commission, the agencies which would be responsible for the administration of the measure, have had an opportunity to express their views.

The measure involves some rather radical changes in the patent laws of the United States, and I am very firmly of the opinion that the Committee on Patents should properly have the bill for consideration.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Mines and Mining be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Patents.

Because of the fact that not many Senators are now on the floor, I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that if the

chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining, or any of its members should feel that the action taken was improvident, I shall raise no objection to having the action reconsidered. I think probably the Committee on Mines and Mining would be happy to have the bill taken out of their hands. I shall have no objection to a reconsideration of what I now propose to have done in case it is deemed necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would be better not to act until the chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining is present. The chairman of the committee is the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. He will be present on Monday, and I rather think it would be better not to act on the matter in his absence.

Mr. BONE. In any event, before the bill is acted on in the Senate, the Committee on Patents, which invariably consults various departments and gathers all possible information with respect to bills referred to it, should have the necessary information and act on the measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that the chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining will not object to the measure being referred to the Committee on Patents, but I think it would be better to wait until he is present.

SUGAR ACT OF 1937

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have one other matter I wish to bring up. I am advised by the parliamentarian that due to the lapse of time the motion I now formally make is not a timely motion unless it receives the unanimous consent of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to enter a motion to reconsider the action by which Senate bill 3237 was passed by the Senate on April 10, on the call of the calendar. I understand it is necessary to have unanimous consent even to make the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. What bill is that?

Mr. BONE. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who now occupies the chair. Mr. President, I make the motion because I was not present when the bill was passed. I have examined the Record and find no discussion of it. The bill involves a subject which I think should receive the attention of Members of the Senate. It involves the question of the use of children in the sugar industry, and I do not believe a bill of that kind should be passed without the mature consideration of the Senate. The bill provides for striking off certain benefits paid to persons who violate the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that a motion to reconsider at this time probably would not be effective for the reason that the bill has gone to the House.

Mr. BONE. I understand that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The only motion which is in order is one to request the House to return the bill to the Senate.

Mr. BONE. I am advised that I must have unanimous consent to enter the motion. If I cannot enter the motion except by unanimous consent, obviously I cannot offer a motion requesting that the bill be returned from the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand that the Senator is obliged to obtain unanimous consent to move to request that the House return the bill to the Senate. The Senator would have to have unanimous consent to move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The Chair is of the opinion that the time to make such a motion has passed and that the Senator from Washington would have to have unanimous consent to make the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Chair mean that the Senator would have to have unanimous consent to ask the House to return the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; to enter the motion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Even assuming that the motion were timely, is it not a fact that as a condition precedent to making the motion it is first necessary to make a motion to request the House to return the bill, and then the motion to reconsider could be made only by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the motion to request return of the bill from the House must be made after the motion to reconsider, and that motion cannot be made except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me state to the Chair that we cannot take action upon a measure which was passed by the Senate, and which is not now in the Senate, but has gone to the House and is beyond our control unless we first asked the House to return the papers.

Mr. BONE. That is what I intended to do after my first motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds, and rule XIII supports the Chair, that the motion cannot be made except by unanimous consent, and that the time to make the motion has passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Chair hold that after a bill has passed the Senate and gone to the House, but has not been acted upon by the House, a motion requesting the House to return the bill to the Senate cannot be made except by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair speaks of motion to reconsider.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not talking about the motion to reconsider. We all know that that has to be made within 2 days after the Senate has acted on the bill. The bill has been sent to the House. It seems to me a motion to return the bill to the Senate is in order at any time before the House passes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion—and the Chair is fortified by the book and the Parliamentarian—that the motion is not in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I yield to the Chair's opinion, but I should like to see the book.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hates to seem so determined, but if my colleague wishes me to show him the book, I will read him rule XIII.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not require that to be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, so that takes care of the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with the point of order which was discussed a moment ago, for the sake of the record I wish to read section 2 of rule XIII, which seems to me to have some application. Section 1 applies to a motion, within 2 days after a bill has been passed, to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. Otherwise, it must be done by unanimous consent. Section 2 refers to a bill, motion, order, or anything which has gone out of the possession of the Senate. I read section 2:

2. When a bill, resolution, report, amendment, order, or message, upon which a vote has been taken, shall have gone out of the possession of the Senate and been communicated to the House of Representatives, the motion to reconsider shall be accompanied by a motion to request the House to return the same; which last motion shall be acted upon immediately, and without debate, and if determined in the negative shall be a final disposition of the motion to reconsider.

Under those circumstances, when a bill has gone to the House any Senator desiring to make a motion to reconsider must accompany that motion by a motion to request the House to return the papers; and the motion to request the House to return the papers must be voted on first. If that motion is decided in the negative, that disposes of the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to have the Senator from Kentucky read the first section. The Chair is of the opinion that a Senator must have the right to make the first motion before he can make the second, and that the second motion is an accompanying motion. The Chair adheres to his first ruling.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Chair, in his wisdom on this subject, what is the difference between the provision of this rule, which refers to 2 days—"the next 2 days"—and the provision of the rule which says that no Senator may speak more than twice in

1 day on the same subject? So far as I can recall, the question has never been authoritatively settled, although it was indicated by the present President pro tempore of the Senate that if the situation should ever arise, he intended to hold that the rule providing that a Senator may not speak more than twice in 1 day on the same subject means twice in the same legislative day.

The language is precisely the same every time the word "day" is used throughout the rules. According to the decision of the Chair as it applies to the present case, it seems that in some cases the rule means a calendar day and in some cases it means a legislative day, although there is no syllable in the rule in either case to justify such a ruling. I should like to ask the Chair, since he wishes to rule on the subject—

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not like to put his judgment against that of the Senator from Missouri; but let the Chair state, in answer to the Senator from Missouri—

MR. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to address the Chair before he rules. It will not do any good to address the Chair after he rules.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

MR. CONNALLY. Of course, the reason for the second paragraph of the rule is that when the Senate loses possession of the papers on a bill which goes to the other body we have no power to do anything about it. The matter is beyond our control. If both Houses should pass a bill, and it should go to the President, neither House could do anything except to request the President to return the bill. The reason why the Senate cannot do anything until it gets the bill is that it is wholly within the jurisdiction of the House. Therefore, the second section of the rule applies only to that sort of a situation.

No doubt, the Chair is familiar with the rule of law that a specific provision overrules a general statute. The first part of the rule is to the effect that after we have taken action, and the bill is still in the Senate, any Senator may make a motion to reconsider within 2 days. If he does not make such a motion within 2 days, unanimous consent is required to obtain reconsideration. That condition applies to a case in which the bill is still in our jurisdiction.

The latter part of the rule, which makes special provision, applies only to bills which have left our jurisdiction; and the rule clearly states that when a Senator makes a motion to reconsider he must accompany it by a motion to request the House to return the bill. If the House grants the request and sends back the bill, then the question recurs on the motion to reconsider. The rule very clearly states that if the motion to request the House to return the papers is determined in the negative, that shall be a final disposition of the motion to reconsider. There is a clear implication that what is meant is a vote, and not unanimous consent. The rule contemplates a vote. If the Senate should then vote to reconsider, it may do so.

So I do not think there ought to be any confusion. There are two separate conceptions. One case applies to a cow, and the other to a horse. The latter part of the rule applies only to a case in which the bill has left our jurisdiction; and if it does apply to that sort of a case, that part overrides the preceding part if there is any conflict, because it makes a specific rule as to a specific state of facts.

MR. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. CONNALLY. I yield.

MR. ADAMS. Of course, the Senator is a parliamentarian. I am not. It seems to me that in the second section the Senate made a very practical application of the rule. It provided that we should not ask to have a bill brought back unless we were in a position to reconsider it. It is perfectly useless for us to ask the House to send back a bill if we are without authority to act upon it. The rule provides that a motion to reconsider after a bill has gone to the House shall be accompanied by a motion to request the House to return the papers. In other words, the two must go together.

MR. CONNALLY. That is correct.

MR. ADAMS. A Senator could not make a motion to recall a bill unless he were also in a position to make a motion to reconsider.

MR. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems to me two propositions are involved; and I am only debating the matter because of the future effect upon the rules.

While the rule requires that when a bill has gone to the House, and is in their possession and out of our possession, a motion to reconsider must be accompanied by a motion to recall the bill, it does not provide that a motion to recall a bill must be accompanied by a motion to reconsider.

Only the other day the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] moved that even the action of conferees on the Naval Appropriation bill be rescinded; and when that was agreed to in the House there was a motion to request the House to return the naval-appropriation bill to the Senate. That was agreed to. When the bill got back to the Senate, the Senator from South Carolina moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. So, while it is true, according to the rule, that when a bill has gone to the House a motion to reconsider must be accompanied by a motion to bring the bill back, it does not follow that a motion to bring a bill back cannot be made without accompanying it by a motion to reconsider.

MR. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. BARKLEY. I yield.

MR. CLARK of Missouri. If the view expressed by the Chair a moment ago were to become a binding rule of the Senate, it would be impossible in any case, when two calendar days had passed, for the Senate ever to request the House to return a bill, no matter what the situation might be. In other words, it could not be done by unanimous consent, because if the request of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] a while ago for unanimous consent was out of order, then what we did in the case of the naval appropriation bill, as suggested by the Senator from Kentucky, was absolutely out of order, and it would always be impossible to recall a bill from the House of Representatives.

MR. BARKLEY. I am not controverting the point made by the Chair that when a bill has gone to the House a motion to reconsider must be accompanied by a motion to bring the bill back to the Senate. The point I make is that the Senate does not have to move to reconsider in order to ask the House to return a bill. It might want to have the bill returned for any purpose without necessarily planning to reconsider the vote by which it passed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Kentucky permit the Chair at least to defend his ruling? The Senate makes its own rules, and the present occupant of the chair must determine questions as he sees them, and that is what he is going to do.

The first section of rule XIII says:

When a question has been decided by the Senate, any Senator voting with the prevailing side or who has not voted—

That amendment was put in the rule by a resolution submitted by Mr. Swanson, of Virginia, when he was a Member of the Senate—

may, on the same day or on either of the next 2 days of actual session thereafter, move a reconsideration; and if the Senate shall refuse to reconsider, or upon reconsideration shall affirm its first decision, no further motion to reconsider shall be in order unless by unanimous consent.

Somebody else may adopt a different view, but the present occupant of the chair felt that he had to adopt the view expressed by the Senator from Colorado. The present occupant of the chair thinks he is accurate in his view.

MR. BARKLEY. I will say to the Chair that there is no controversy about that.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. A request was made for unanimous consent. The action cannot be taken under the circumstances except by unanimous consent. If the Senator had secured it, in the opinion of the Chair, his motion to reconsider would have had to be considered together with a

motion to ask the House to return the bill. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to emphasize that while the rule does require a motion to reconsider to be accompanied by a motion to recall the bill, there is nothing in the rule which says that a straight motion by itself to ask the House to return a bill to the Senate cannot be made at any time before the House acts on the bill. It might not be for the purpose of reconsideration; but if it is for the purpose of reconsideration, and the motion is made, they have to be joined together. But when the Senate, or either body, wants to ask the other body to return a bill for any purpose, without regard to a motion to reconsider, and the other House is willing to return it, I think certainly that can be done upon motion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement simply because this record may become a matter of precedent.

The only reason why I do not appeal from the decision of the Chair, which I think is clearly erroneous, is that there is nothing before the Senate upon which the Chair can pass at the present time. If it were an appealable decision I should certainly make the appeal, and insist upon the Senate itself making this revolutionary decision, rather than the Parliamentarian or the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would have no objection to that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I simply desire to preserve in the RECORD the fact that there was nothing before the Senate upon which the Chair could adequately make a decision which was appealable, in order that it may never in the future be considered as a precedent.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I apologize to the Chair and to the other Senators for taking up any more time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Texas will permit the Chair, he would like to say to the Senator from Missouri that the Senator who now occupies the Chair has had decisions appealed from before, and if it developed that he was in error he would not mind being reversed; but the occupant of the chair, not believing he was in error, had determined to make the decision he made, and presently he is going to stand on it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Chair will permit me, I will say that if the decision were one from which an appeal would lie, I should be very glad to make the appeal in order that the matter might be settled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupant of the chair would have no objection to that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, of course, as stated by the Senator from Missouri, the ruling is not a precedent, because nothing has arisen upon which a ruling is necessary; but let me make a suggestion before the Chair concludes the matter.

As I view it, the Senate cannot do anything about a bill when it has not possession of it. It is in the House. The only thing the Senate can do is to request the return of the bill.

I do not expect to change the Chair's opinion—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not today, because the Chair has already made his ruling.

Mr. CONNALLY. But I want the RECORD to show the reason that I urge.

The Senate cannot give unanimous consent as to anything about the bill, except to recall it. We cannot now pass upon the motion to reconsider. We cannot do it by unanimous consent. We cannot consider it. We could not reconsider our action on the bill if every Member of the Senate were yelling at the top of his voice to reconsider it until we got the bill back from the House.

What right has this group here this afternoon, just a few of us, to assume that when the Senate does get the bill back some Senator will object to its reconsideration? When it got back here it might be that we could get unanimous consent to reconsider it. We have no right to prejudge tonight what may happen a month from now, when the bill comes back. We might reconsider it by unanimous con-

sent; or, if the construction of the senior Senator from Kentucky is correct, we might reconsider it by a majority vote. So my contention is that all the Senate can do now is either to ask that the bill be sent back or refuse to ask that it be sent back.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. For a motion to ask the House to return a measure, unanimous consent is not required.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It may be done by motion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then, after the bill comes back, it is subjected to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair say, however, that the request of the Senator from Washington was for permission to make the motion. He had to have unanimous consent to make it, and the Senate would not give it to him.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is how the matter comes to the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair is right about that. The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] made no formal motion, and he did not accompany his request to reconsider by a motion to recall the bill from the House. The request he made was objected to, and therefore the matter went out of the window.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is what the Chair said.

Mr. BARKLEY. So it is a moot question now so far as any ruling of the Chair is concerned, anyway.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, in order that the matter may come to repose, I shall occupy half a moment in pouring balm into our wounds and oil on all these troubled waters.

May all the gods in all the pantheons forgive my unworthy self for ever precipitating this argument into the laps of the parliamentary experts. I am absolving myself from any sort of responsibility for any opinions that have been uttered. I was advised by the Parliamentarian to make the motion that I did. I naturally looked to our very able Parliamentarian to advise me in matters of that kind. It is not my understanding that I have to couple the two motions together in so many words in the same line. I might have to do so in the same paragraph, but I did not think it was necessary to do it in the same line, even though I could divide the requests by semicolons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington never got that far.

Mr. BONE. I was assailed horse, foot, and dragoon, front, flank, and rear, before I could turn; and when I knew, or was duly advised by most eminent authority, that I had to have unanimous consent, I knew that I was sunk without trace, with no oil on the surface, when there was an objection. So, an objection being entered, and realizing that that ends the performance, I presume my efforts to have the bill brought back are futile.

I do feel that the Senate should have considered the bill. Perhaps I am in error, and the Senator from Louisiana, who presented this efficiently and fully to our colleagues here at the time it passed, could satisfy them if they had any misgivings. It did involve little children, one 14 years of age, children employed by a large number of corporations in the South, and I felt that, involving them, in our fight against child labor we might better have had the question passed on directly by a vote of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the

United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. GUFFEY, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, reported favorably the nomination of Royd R. Sayers, of Virginia, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, vice John Wellington Finch, resigned.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably without amendment Executive A (76th Cong., 1st sess.), a convention between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa September 15, 1938, providing for emergency regulation of the level of Rainy Lake and of other boundary waters in the Rainy Lake watershed, as recommended by the international joint commission established pursuant to the provisions of the treaty signed at Washington on January 11, 1909, relating to questions arising between the United States of America and Canada, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 9) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further reports of committees?

ASSISTANT POSTMASTERS GENERAL

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I report favorably the nomination of Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, to be First Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, vice William W. Howes, and the nomination of Smith W. Purdum, of Maryland, to be Second Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, vice Ambrose O'Connell.

Mr. President, these nominations were unanimously approved by 16 members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, all those in the city today, and on account of the high character and standing of these two prominent officials, and since I believe they will meet the approval of all Senators, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nominations.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, the last thing I wish to do is in any way to oppose the unanimous-consent request of my former chairman; he will remember that I at one time served on his committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I remember that with pleasure.

Mr. BARBOUR. I should like to ask the Senator whether the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], or the assistant leader on this side, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], or any other Senator on this side, had any knowledge of this at least unexpected suggestion on the part of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I find that the following Republican members of the committee signed the report: The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. BARBOUR. The Senator has one Republican there, thus far.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a fair average, is it not? [Laughter.]

Mr. BARBOUR. Not always.

Mr. McKELLAR. There are only two whose names are signed to the list.

Mr. BARBOUR. I find myself in a very embarrassing position. I do not know just what to do. If there is any real urgency or need for speed, I shall not object.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know that there is any urgency or need for speed, but I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who does not know Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Purdum. They are well-known, efficient, and able officials, who have been promoted because of a resignation above them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Both of them are at present Assistant Postmasters General.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are. If any objection shall be made hereafter, I shall be perfectly willing to have the nominations reconsidered.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that there is no change in pay and really no change in rank. They are merely shifted from one place to another, and both have been heretofore confirmed.

Mr. BARBOUR. My objection was on no other ground except that at this late hour it appeared that a matter was to be rather hurriedly considered, and I was not entirely sure what my duty on this side of the aisle might be.

Mr. McKELLAR. They have heretofore been confirmed by the Senate, I believe twice.

Mr. BARBOUR. I have no personal objection whatever, and, in the light of what the Senator stated a moment ago, I am perfectly willing not to make any objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator, and ask for immediate consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first nomination reported by the Senator from Tennessee.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ambrose O'Connell to be First Assistant Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Smith W. Purdum to be Second Assistant Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dennis A. Phelan to be collector of customs for customs-collection district No. 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 27, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 24 (legislative day of April 24) 1940

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John R. Minter, of South Carolina, to be a Foreign Service officer of class four, a consul, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

Sheldon Thomas, of New York, to be a Foreign Service officer of class five, a consul, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

First Lt. Harold Myers Deane, Veterinary Corps Reserve, to be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps, with rank from date of appointment.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY
TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. Frederick Raymond Keeler, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 1, 1935.

TO AIR CORPS, EFFECTIVE JUNE 22, 1940

First Lt. Jean Paul Craig, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1937.

Second Lt. Milton Bernard Adams, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Walter James Alsop, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Benjamin Franklin Avery 2d, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Burnham Lucius Batson, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Donald Roy Boss, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Charles Henry Bowman, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. William Stein Boyd, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Harry Nathan Brandon, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Adam Kirk Breckenridge, Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Roy Ray Brischetto, Infantry, with rank from June 14, 1938.

Second Lt. Elmore George Brown, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. John Wilson Carpenter, 3d, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. John Alexander Chechila, Signal Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Thomas Jonathon Jackson Christian, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Roscoe Campbell Crawford, Jr., Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Warner Winston Croxton, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Joseph Lawrence Dickman, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Elwood Paul Donohue, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. John Carlos Edwards, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Melvin Verner Engstrom, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Albert Leslie Evans, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Walter Woodrow Farmer, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Shepler Ward FitzGerald, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Frederick Henry Foerster, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Joseph Harold Frost, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. James David Garcia, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. William Ames Garnett, Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Benoid Earl Glawe, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Robert Evans Greer, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Hugh Albert Griffith, Jr., Signal Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Strother Banks Hardwick, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Laird Woodruff Hendricks, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Allen Forrest Herzberg, Signal Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Charles Henry Hillhouse, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Perry Milo Holsington, 2d, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Carl Walter Hollstein, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. George Edmund Howard, Jr., Signal Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Robert David Hunter, Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. John Ernest Linwood Huse, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Frank Wallace Iseman, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Ellsworth Reily Jacoby, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. William Charles Jones, Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. George Yount Jumper, Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Joseph Theodore Kingsley, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Andrew John Kinney, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. James Barclay Knapp, Signal Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Harmon Lampley, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Edwin John Latoszewski, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Robert Roy Little, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Charles James Long, 3d, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Paul Joseph Long, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Richard Gordon Lycan, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Salvatore Edward Manzo, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. William Kemp Martin, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. James Elmer Mather, Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Ernest Beverly Maxwell, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. James Lloyd McBride, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. John Louis McCoy, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. William Lee McDowell, Jr., Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Cecil Cerel McFarland, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Norman James McGowan, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Matthew James McKeever, Jr., Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Elbert Owen Meals, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Jack Gordon Merrell, Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Maurice Myron Miller, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Robert Benjamin Miller, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Richard Steele Morrison, Signal Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Richard Van Wyck Negley, Jr., Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Paul Richard Okerbloom, Signal Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Leonard Neil Palmer, Signal Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Joseph George Perry, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Raymond Thompson Petersen, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Roger Edwards Phelan, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. John George Pickard, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Robert Charwood Richardson, 3d, Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Robert John Rogers, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Eugene Allen Romig, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. John Spoor Samuel, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Edwin Peter Schmid, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Robert Carver Sears, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. William Thomas Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Lewis Wilson Stocking, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Henry Riggs Sullivan, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Daniel Farrington Tatum, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Robert Cochrane Twyman, Signal Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Leon Robert Vance, Jr., Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Elliott Vandevanter, Jr., Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Alfred Virgil Walton, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Charles Manly Walton, Jr., Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Robert Clarence Whipple, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. David Kenneth White, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Thomas Bernard Whitehouse, Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Ray Joseph Will, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. James Walter Wilson, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Robert Merwyn Wray, Signal Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Tilden Perkins Wright, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Prentiss Davis Wynne, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. George Wallace Roger Zethren, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1939.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONEL

Lt. Col. Carl Fish McKinney, Infantry, from May 16, 1940.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Maj. John Matthew Devine, Field Artillery, from May 16, 1940.

TO BE MAJORS

Capt. Henry Charles Wolfe, Corps of Engineers, from May 16, 1940.

Capt. Lemuel Edwin Edwards, Finance Department, from May 16, 1940.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Clyde H. West to be postmaster at Centre, Ala., in place of C. H. West. Incumbent's commission expires June 8, 1940.

Annie M. Campbell to be postmaster at Lexington, Ala., in place of A. M. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Robert A. Reid to be postmaster at Montevallo, Ala., in place of R. A. Reid. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Oscar Sheffield to be postmaster at Pine Hill, Ala., in place of Oscar Sheffield. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Stella K. Martin to be postmaster at Plantersville, Ala., in place of S. K. Martin. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Frank Poole to be postmaster at Wetumpka, Ala., in place of Frank Poole. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Velma F. Murdock to be postmaster at Wilson Dam, Ala., in place of V. F. Murdock. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1940.

Maggie Winningham to be postmaster at York, Ala., in place of Maggie Winningham. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1940.

ARIZONA

Winnie M. Johnson to be postmaster at Gilbert, Ariz., in place of W. M. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Josie B. Fenwick to be postmaster at Litchfield Park, Ariz., in place of J. B. Fenwick. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Fred B. Moore to be postmaster at Morenci, Ariz., in place of F. B. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Edward M. Schmidt to be postmaster at Tolleson, Ariz., in place of E. M. Schmidt. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Ruth L. Streett to be postmaster at Warren, Ariz., in place of R. L. Streett. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

ARKANSAS

Joe C. Allen to be postmaster at Cove, Ark., in place of J. C. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Edgar G. Gunnels to be postmaster at Emerson, Ark., in place of E. G. Gunnels. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Hoyt D. Estep to be postmaster at Hartman, Ark., in place of H. D. Estep. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Bunyan Gilbert to be postmaster at McRae, Ark., in place of Bunyan Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Norine W. Thomas to be postmaster at Norman, Ark., in place of N. W. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Alvin J. Wages to be postmaster at Norphlet, Ark., in place of A. J. Wages. Incumbent's commission expires June 3, 1940.

Frank N. Johnston to be postmaster at Ozark, Ark., in place of F. N. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired March 21, 1940.

Kenneth W. Crook to be postmaster at Pangburn, Ark., in place of K. W. Crook. Incumbent's commission expires July 7, 1940.

Lewis F. Strickland to be postmaster at Trumann, Ark., in place of L. F. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

CALIFORNIA

Louis H. Hoskins to be postmaster at Anaheim, Calif., in place of L. H. Hoskins. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Carl C. McClellan to be postmaster at Barstow, Calif., in place of A. A. True, retired.

Walter I. Ricketts to be postmaster at Biggs, Calif., in place of W. I. Ricketts. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

Fred M. Snider to be postmaster at Colton, Calif., in place of F. M. Snider. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Reuben C. Yarger to be postmaster at Loleta, Calif., in place of R. C. Yarger. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Clarence N. Hamblet to be postmaster at Oildale, Calif., in place of C. N. Hamblet. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

John I. Fiscus to be postmaster at Rio Vista, Calif., in place of J. I. Fiscus. Incumbent's commission expires June 2, 1940.

Alva M. Smith to be postmaster at Shasta Dam, Calif. Office became Presidential October 1, 1939.

Walter L. Murphy to be postmaster at Sonoma, Calif., in place of W. L. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

J. Howard Clark to be postmaster at Tulare, Calif., in place of J. H. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Frank E. Chambers to be postmaster at Victorville, Calif., in place of C. H. Godshall. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1939.

Gertrude M. Cox to be postmaster at Walkermine, Calif., in place of D. W. Folsom, resigned.

Edward Marion Sehorn to be postmaster at Willows, Calif., in place of E. M. Sehorn. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

COLORADO

Daniel B. Venable to be postmaster at Ault, Colo., in place of D. B. Venable. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1940.

Bernard C. Killin to be postmaster at Kiowa, Colo., in place of B. C. Killin. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Nea G. Gallegos to be postmaster at San Luis, Colo., in place of N. G. Gallegos. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Leo F. Houston to be postmaster at Sugar City, Colo., in place of L. F. Houston. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

Mark S. Cole to be postmaster at Yampa, Colo., in place of M. S. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

CONNECTICUT

Leo A. Legros to be postmaster at Baltic, Conn., in place of L. A. Legros. Incumbent's commission expires June 19, 1940.

Lillian N. Snow to be postmaster at Milldale, Conn., in place of L. N. Snow. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Francis T. Green to be postmaster at Naugatuck, Conn., in place of F. T. Green. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1940.

James T. Kelley to be postmaster at New Canaan, Conn., in place of J. T. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Michael P. Spezzano to be postmaster at Riverside, Conn., in place of M. P. Spezzano. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

John J. O'Keefe to be postmaster at Southington, Conn., in place of J. J. O'Keefe. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Cornelius P. McGuinness to be postmaster at Stamford, Conn., in place of C. P. McGuinness. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

DELAWARE

James B. Thompson, Jr., to be postmaster at Clayton, Del., in place of J. B. Thompson, Jr. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Clara C. McVey to be postmaster at Marshallton, Del., in place of C. C. McVey. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

FLORIDA

Eva E. Ward to be postmaster at Macclenny, Fla., in place of E. E. Ward. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Henry A. Drake to be postmaster at Port St. Joe, Fla., in place of H. A. Drake. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1940.

GEORGIA

Dean R. Adams to be postmaster at Boston, Ga., in place of D. R. Adams. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Fred M. Chandler to be postmaster at Bowman, Ga., in place of F. M. Chandler. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Mary Lou Burch to be postmaster at Eastman, Ga., in place of M. L. Burch. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1940.

John R. Jones to be postmaster at Dahlonga, Ga., in place of J. R. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Victor H. Carmichael to be postmaster at Jackson, Ga., in place of V. H. Carmichael. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

Joseph R. Nease to be postmaster at Lumber City, Ga., in place of J. R. Nease. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

Emory Davis to be postmaster at Rutledge, Ga., in place of Emory Davis. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

IDAHO

Emory Olson to be postmaster at Deary, Idaho, in place of Emory Olson. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Sara H. Huff to be postmaster at Driggs, Idaho, in place of S. H. Huff. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

George F. Walker to be postmaster at Hailey, Idaho, in place of G. F. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1940.

Ralph Waldo Cope to be postmaster at Harrison, Idaho, in place of R. W. Cope. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

ILLINOIS

Arthur McKinney to be postmaster at Alto Pass, Ill., in place of Arthur McKinney. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Virginia F. Dodge to be postmaster at Arlington Heights, Ill., in place of V. F. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Effie B. Mueller to be postmaster at De Soto, Ill., in place of E. B. Mueller. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Ellis S. Sharp to be postmaster at Eureka, Ill., in place of H. R. Tomb, resigned.

Robert R. Newton to be postmaster at Goreville, Ill., in place of R. R. Newton. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

William H. Cato to be postmaster at Homewood, Ill., in place of W. H. Cato. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Clyde Hardbarger to be postmaster at Illiopolis, Ill., in place of Clyde Hardbarger. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

J. Walter Lowrey to be postmaster at Joliet, Ill., in place of J. W. Lowrey. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1939.

Francis J. Keigher to be postmaster at Manteno, Ill., in place of F. J. Keigher. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Mary R. Wilson to be postmaster at Milan, Ill., in place of M. R. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

Edith Brain to be postmaster at Orient, Ill., in place of Edith Brain. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

John S. Kaler to be postmaster at Rantoul, Ill., in place of J. S. Kaler. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Edward P. Devine to be postmaster at Somonauk, Ill., in place of E. P. Devine. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Rudolph L. Lightfoot to be postmaster at Stonefort, Ill., in place of R. L. Lightfoot. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

George E. Kull to be postmaster at Strasburg, Ill., in place of G. E. Kull. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

George Lyons to be postmaster at Tilden, Ill., in place of George Lyons. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Frank E. Binkley to be postmaster at Warrensburg, Ill., in place of F. E. Binkley. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

George M. Mader to be postmaster at Waverly, Ill., in place of G. M. Mader. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

INDIANA

Edward Bracher to be postmaster at Boonville, Ind., in place of Edward Bracher. Incumbent's commission expires June 19, 1940.

William Henry Lynch to be postmaster at Boswell, Ind., in place of W. H. Lynch. Incumbent's commission expires July 13, 1940.

Roy L. Jones to be postmaster at Colfax, Ind., in place of R. L. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Edward G. Arnold to be postmaster at Dubois, Ind., in place of E. G. Arnold. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Jacob De Groot to be postmaster at Highland, Ind., in place of Jacob De Groot. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Sylvester O. Kelly to be postmaster at Logansport, Ind., in place of G. A. Raub, Jr., resigned.

Henry Harold Zollman to be postmaster at Medora, Ind., in place of T. W. Hall, transferred.

Edward H. Scales to be postmaster at Petersburg, Ind., in place of E. H. Scales. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1940.

Guy Dunlap to be postmaster at Poseyville, Ind., in place of Guy Dunlap. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Bernard J. McCaffery to be postmaster at South Bend, Ind., in place of B. J. McCaffery. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Alonzo L. Rogers to be postmaster at Walkerton, Ind., in place of A. L. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1940.

IOWA

Ellen B. Neff to be postmaster at Calamus, Iowa, in place of E. B. Neff. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Alice E. Owens to be postmaster at Carlisle, Iowa, in place of A. E. Owens. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

William T. Oakes to be postmaster at Clinton, Iowa, in place of W. T. Oakes. Incumbent's commission expires July 13, 1940.

J. Gerald Christy to be postmaster at Coon Rapids, Iowa, in place of J. G. Christy. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

William R. Flemming to be postmaster at Forest City, Iowa, in place of W. R. Flemming. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1939.

Anna T. Wieland to be postmaster at Gladbrook, Iowa, in place of A. T. Wieland. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Ralph V. Johnson to be postmaster at Hudson, Iowa, in place of R. V. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Henry Dahl to be postmaster at Hull, Iowa, in place of Henry Dahl. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Walter J. Barrow to be postmaster at Iowa City, Iowa, in place of W. J. Barrow. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1940.

Oscar K. Dick to be postmaster at Iowa Falls, Iowa, in place of O. K. Dick. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Walter J. Leslie to be postmaster at Lakota, Iowa, in place of W. J. Leslie. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Glen Vauthrin to be postmaster at Melbourne, Iowa, in place of Glen Vauthrin. Incumbent's commission expires June 19, 1940.

Peter J. McGrath to be postmaster at Mount Ayr, Iowa, in place of P. J. McGrath. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Stacia E. Hartley to be postmaster at New Albin, Iowa, in place of S. E. Hartley. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

Esther M. Olson to be postmaster at Pacific Junction, Iowa, in place of E. M. Olson. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

George J. Mettlin to be postmaster at Russell, Iowa, in place of G. J. Mettlin. Incumbent's commission expires June 19, 1940.

Glenn C. Bowdish to be postmaster at Springville, Iowa, in place of G. C. Bowdish. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Robert Edwin Liston to be postmaster at State Center, Iowa, in place of R. E. Liston. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Peter Peterson to be postmaster at Story City, Iowa, in place of Peter Peterson. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Peter T. Belgard to be postmaster at Tipton, Iowa, in place of P. T. Belgard. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

James P. Dorothy to be postmaster at Ute, Iowa, in place of J. P. Dorothy. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Collis E. Moore to be postmaster at Villisca, Iowa, in place of J. F. Taylor, deceased.

Bernice Herrick to be postmaster at Wapello, Iowa, in place of Bernice Herrick. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Lester P. Sausser to be postmaster at Worthington, Iowa, in place of L. P. Sausser. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

KANSAS

Clarence H. White to be postmaster at Burlington, Kans., in place of C. H. White. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1940.

John A. Rogers to be postmaster at Cherryvale, Kans., in place of J. A. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1940.

Emil R. Schwemmer to be postmaster at Durham, Kans., in place of E. R. Schwemmer. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

John F. Holshouser to be postmaster at Dwight, Kans., in place of J. F. Holshouser. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Edward Grauerholz to be postmaster at Esbon, Kans., in place of Edward Grauerholz. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Jessie M. Grimes to be postmaster at Eudora, Kans., in place of J. M. Grimes. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

George F. Colwell to be postmaster at Glasco, Kans., in place of G. F. Colwell. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Ferdinand Scharping to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Kans., in place of Ferdinand Scharping. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

Susanna J. Jones to be postmaster at Maplehill, Kans., in place of S. J. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Selma E. Hatfield to be postmaster at Moundridge, Kans., in place of S. E. Hatfield. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1940.

Chester M. Cook to be postmaster at Ness City, Kans., in place of C. M. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Mason V. Dunlap to be postmaster at Osawatimie, Kans., in place of M. V. Dunlap. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Fred Swisher to be postmaster at Pratt, Kans., in place of Fred Swisher. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1940.

Helen L. Green to be postmaster at Silver Lake, Kans., in place of H. L. Green. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Harry E. Blevins to be postmaster at Stafford, Kans., in place of H. E. Blevins. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1939.

Irene M. Warrell to be postmaster at Zenda, Kans., in place of I. M. Warrell. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

KENTUCKY

Henry S. Bogan to be postmaster at Franklin, Ky., in place of H. S. Bogan. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1939.

John B. Pendleton to be postmaster at Hardyville, Ky., in place of J. B. Pendleton. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Octavia M. Sturgill to be postmaster at Hindman, Ky., in place of O. M. Sturgill. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1940.

John D. McDonogh to be postmaster at Jeffersontown, Ky., in place of J. D. McDonogh. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Elizabeth L. Arnold to be postmaster at Lewisburg, Ky., in place of E. L. Arnold. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1940.

James C. Morris to be postmaster at Masonic Home, Ky., in place of J. C. Morris. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Raymond E. Doyle to be postmaster at Park City, Ky., in place of R. E. Doyle. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Virginia L. Daniel to be postmaster at Van Lear, Ky., in place of V. L. Daniel. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1939.

LOUISIANA

Henry E. Knight to be postmaster at Ferriday, La., in place of H. E. Knight. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Albert B. Coroy to be postmaster at Gonzales, La., in place of A. B. Coroy. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1940.

Sidney L. Voorhies to be postmaster at Lafayette, La., in place of E. A. O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Ethel T. Gauthier to be postmaster at Lake Arthur, La., in place of E. T. Gauthier. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Lawrence S. Bourgeois to be postmaster at Schriever, La., in place of L. S. Bourgeois. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

MAINE

Arthur J. Remillard to be postmaster at Biddeford, Maine, in place of A. J. Remillard. Incumbent's commission expires June 8, 1940.

Blanche W. Brown to be postmaster at Dover-Foxcroft, Maine, in place of B. W. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Marguerite A. Cahill to be postmaster at Easton, Maine, in place of M. A. Cahill. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Oscar A. Kelley to be postmaster at Jonesport, Maine, in place of O. A. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

George L. Murray to be postmaster at Newport, Maine, in place of G. L. Murray. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Thomas G. Burdin to be postmaster at Turner, Maine, in place of T. G. Burdin. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

MARYLAND

John Mercer Terrell to be postmaster at Elkton, Md., in place of J. M. Terrell. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Grace V. Thompson to be postmaster at Hurlock, Md., in place of G. V. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

James F. Quinn to be postmaster at Lonaconing, Md., in place of J. F. Quinn. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

John T. Barrow to be postmaster at Perryville, Md., in place of J. T. Barrow. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

MASSACHUSETTS

F. Thomas Ellis to be postmaster at Brewster, Mass., in place of F. T. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

H. Francis Kiernan to be postmaster at Collinsville, Mass., in place of H. F. Kiernan. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Thomas F. Donahue to be postmaster at Groton, Mass., in place of T. F. Donahue. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1940.

Arthur F. Cahoon to be postmaster at Harwich, Mass., in place of A. F. Cahoon. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Clarkson P. Bearse to be postmaster at Harwich Port, Mass., in place of C. P. Bearse. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

William P. O'Grady to be postmaster at Holliston, Mass., in place of W. P. O'Grady. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

John Woods Kelley to be postmaster at Newburyport, Mass., in place of J. W. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

William W. Dooling to be postmaster at North Adams, Mass., in place of W. W. Dooling. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Timothy J. Sullivan to be postmaster at Palmer, Mass., in place of T. J. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

James L. Sullivan to be postmaster at Peabody, Mass., in place of J. L. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1940.

Gertrude H. Laramie to be postmaster at Russell, Mass., in place of G. H. Laramie. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

George E. Brady to be postmaster at Westfield, Mass., in place of E. J. Sammons, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Frank E. Browning to be postmaster at Battle Creek, Mich., in place of F. E. Browning. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Livingstone Latham to be postmaster at Clinton, Mich., in place of Livingstone Latham. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Fred W. Zehnder to be postmaster at Frankenmuth, Mich., in place of F. W. Zehnder. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1940.

Thomas Johnston to be postmaster at Marshall, Mich., in place of W. B. Welles, deceased.

Francis J. Otterbacher to be postmaster at Sand Lake, Mich., in place of G. A. Blanchard, removed.

MINNESOTA

Palmer M. Swenson to be postmaster at Dawson, Minn., in place of P. M. Swenson. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1940.

Kalervo O. Finnilla to be postmaster at Floodwood, Minn., in place of K. O. Finnilla. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Henry L. Peters to be postmaster at Glencoe, Minn., in place of H. L. Peters. Incumbent's commission expires July 7, 1940.

Calvin R. Bouvette to be postmaster at Hallock, Minn., in place of C. R. Bouvette. Incumbent's commission expires June 11, 1940.

Alfred Erickson to be postmaster at Lake Bronson, Minn., in place of Alfred Erickson. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1940.

Charles Mechura to be postmaster at Lonsdale, Minn., in place of Charles Mechura. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1940.

Henry Hillesheim to be postmaster at Madelia, Minn., in place of Henry Hillesheim. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Ross Andrews to be postmaster at Meadowlands, Minn., in place of Ross Andrews. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Rudolph S. Viitala to be postmaster at Mountain Iron, Minn., in place of R. S. Viitala. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1940.

William J. Crook to be postmaster at Pipestone, Minn., in place of W. J. Crook. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1940.

Arthur F. Hernlem to be postmaster at Red Wing, Minn., in place of A. F. Hernlem. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

John C. Christensen to be postmaster at Ruthton, Minn., in place of J. C. Christensen. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1940.

Harry C. Mertz to be postmaster at Shakopee, Minn., in place of H. C. Mertz. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

George W. Phares to be postmaster at Sturgeon Lake, Minn., in place of G. W. Phares. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1940.

Joseph Trojohn to be postmaster at Woodlake, Minn., in place of Joseph Trojohn. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1940.

MISSISSIPPI

Romie Green to be postmaster at Amory, Miss., in place of Romie Green. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1940.

Lily B. McDonald to be postmaster at Bay Springs, Miss., in place of L. B. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1940.

W. Hugh Magee to be postmaster at Crystal Springs, Miss., in place of W. H. Magee. Incumbent's commission expired August 27, 1939.

William D. Fisher to be postmaster at Dundee, Miss., in place of W. D. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1940.

Edward Otis Johnson to be postmaster at Glen Allan, Miss., in place of E. O. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1940.

Fannie L. Lowry to be postmaster at Houston, Miss., in place of F. L. Lowry. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

Cecil W. Tinnin to be postmaster at Isola, Miss., in place of C. W. Tinnin. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1940.

David C. Branham, Jr., to be postmaster at Itta Bena, Miss., in place of D. C. Branham, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1940.

Christine H. Douglas to be postmaster at Maben, Miss., in place of C. H. Douglas. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Clifford E. Ball to be postmaster at Tylertown, Miss., in place of C. E. Ball. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

MISSOURI

Walter Bartlett to be postmaster at Bethany, Mo., in place of Walter Bartlett. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

Leonard Moore to be postmaster at California, Mo., in place of Leonard Moore. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1940.

Mary B. Rice to be postmaster at Campbell, Mo., in place of M. B. Rice. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1940.

Bailey F. Brooks to be postmaster at Caruthersville, Mo., in place of B. F. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1940.

Robert L. O'Neal to be postmaster at Creighton, Mo., in place of Robert O'Neal. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1940.

William S. Miller to be postmaster at Drexel, Mo., in place of W. S. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Walter T. Jensen to be postmaster at Eolia, Mo., in place of W. T. Jensen. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Velma B. Watt to be postmaster at Green City, Mo., in place of V. B. Watt. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

James T. Glass, Jr., to be postmaster at Holden, Mo., in place of J. T. Glass, Jr. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Anna Watson to be postmaster at Marceline, Mo., in place of Anna Watson. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Price M. Christian to be postmaster at Monroe City, Mo., in place of P. M. Christian. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Albert O. Allen to be postmaster at New Madrid, Mo., in place of A. O. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1939.

Anna L. Robinson to be postmaster at Oak Grove, Mo., in place of A. L. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expires June 8, 1940.

Lawrence P. Brennan to be postmaster of Pacific, Mo., in place of L. P. Brennan. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Hugh I. Holmes to be postmaster at Saint Charles, Mo., in place of H. I. Holmes. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Shelby Feely to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Mo., in place of Shelby Feely. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Jessie L. Gates to be postmaster at Urich, Mo., in place of J. L. Gates. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Barbara L. McLin to be postmaster at Willard, Mo., in place of B. L. McLin. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

MONTANA

Lee Biggerstaff to be postmaster at Charlo, Mont., in place of Lee Biggerstaff. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Charles Gibson Monkman to be postmaster at Choteau, Mont., in place of C. G. Monkman. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Emma M. Minette to be postmaster at Cut Bank, Mont., in place of E. M. Minette. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

John E. Brennan to be postmaster at Harlem, Mont., in place of J. E. Brennan. Incumbent's commission expires June 2, 1940.

William G. Kelly to be postmaster at Kalispell, Mont., in place of W. G. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

George T. O'Brien to be postmaster at Sidney, Mont., in place of G. T. O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Reginald W. Spangler to be postmaster at Superior, Mont., in place of R. W. Spangler. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Richard B. Vickers to be postmaster at Virginia City, Mont., in place of R. B. Vickers. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

NEBRASKA

Frank A. Badura to be postmaster at Ashton, Nebr., in place of F. A. Badura. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

Joe R. Brown to be postmaster at Ceresco, Nebr., in place of J. R. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires June 19, 1940.

Wayne E. Parker to be postmaster at Farnam, Nebr., in place of W. E. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

Frank Johnson to be postmaster at North Loup, Nebr., in place of Frank Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

George P. Miller to be postmaster at Papillion, Nebr., in place of G. P. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires June 19, 1940.

Alfred A. Ristow to be postmaster at Scribner, Nebr., in place of A. A. Ristow. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Floyd A. Garrett to be postmaster at Whitman, Nebr., in place of F. A. Garrett. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

NEVADA

Judson V. Hooper to be postmaster at Eureka, Nev., in place of P. H. Hurley, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Stuart W. Heard to be postmaster at Center Sandwich, N. H., in place of S. W. Heard. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Bernard F. Nixon to be postmaster at East Rochester, N. H., in place of B. F. Nixon. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

NEW JERSEY

Edwin Douglas Hill to be postmaster at Andover, N. J., in place of E. D. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1940.

Woodrow W. Britton to be postmaster at Bayville, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1939.

Arthur C. King to be postmaster at Beach Haven, N. J., in place of A. C. King. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1940.

Christian J. Hansen to be postmaster at Bloomingdale, N. J., in place of C. J. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Sarah E. Bellis to be postmaster at Bloomsbury, N. J., in place of S. E. Bellis. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

James P. Carey to be postmaster at Boonton, N. J., in place of J. P. Carey. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Austin W. Thompson to be postmaster at Chester, N. J., in place of A. W. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Aubrey H. Phillips to be postmaster at Clementon, N. J., in place of A. H. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Margaret M. McKenna to be postmaster at Convent Station, N. J., in place of E. M. Sharkey, resigned.

Raymond P. Jones to be postmaster at Fair Haven, N. J., in place of R. P. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Elizabeth B. Egan to be postmaster at Lyons, N. J., in place of E. B. Egan. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Robert P. Cosgrove to be postmaster at Madison, N. J., in place of R. P. Cosgrove. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Elah Collins to be postmaster at Pequannock, N. J., in place of Elah Collins. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Stephen W. Margerum to be postmaster at Princeton, N. J., in place of S. W. Margerum. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1939.

Eleanor Earling to be postmaster at Roebling, N. J., in place of Eleanor Earling. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Berkeley W. Moore to be postmaster at Somerville, N. J., in place of B. W. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Rose C. O'Hanlon to be postmaster at South Orange, N. J., in place of R. C. O'Hanlon. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Otto F. Heinz to be postmaster at Springfield, N. J., in place of O. F. Heinz. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

John H. Traynor to be postmaster at Westfield, N. J., in place of J. H. Traynor. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Libert A. Martinelli to be postmaster at Williamstown, N. J., in place of L. A. Martinelli. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

NEW YORK

Annie C. Johnsen to be postmaster at Albertson, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1939.

Alberta J. Webber to be postmaster at Atlanta, N. Y., in place of A. J. Webber. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1940.

Joseph G. Mattes to be postmaster at Avon, N. Y., in place of J. G. Mattes. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1940.

Walter Longwell to be postmaster at Bath, N. Y., in place of Walter Longwell. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

Henry E. Benedict to be postmaster at Broadalbin, N. Y., in place of H. E. Benedict. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Milton B. Empie to be postmaster at Brownville, N. Y., in place of M. B. Empie. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

John F. McGovern to be postmaster at Caledonia, N. Y., in place of J. F. McGovern. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1940.

Ronald S. Kingston to be postmaster at Canaseraga, N. Y., in place of R. S. Kingston. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Katherine M. Raps to be postmaster at Clarence Center, N. Y., in place of K. M. Raps. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

George Leigh Dye to be postmaster at Cuba, N. Y., in place of G. L. Dye. Incumbent's commission expires June 19, 1940.
Dorris E. Boss to be postmaster at Dalton, N. Y., in place of D. E. Boss. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1940.

Henry A. Stecking to be postmaster at East Northport, N. Y., in place of H. A. Stecking. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1940.

Raymond A. Switzer to be postmaster at Ebenezer, N. Y., in place of R. A. Switzer. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1940.

Eva M. Wood to be postmaster at Elbridge, N. Y., in place of E. M. Wood. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Thomas N. Manion to be postmaster at Ferndale, N. Y., in place of T. N. Manion. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Alice L. Lyon to be postmaster at Fort Ann, N. Y., in place of A. L. Lyon. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Sarah K. Gibbs to be postmaster at Glenfield, N. Y., in place of S. K. Gibbs. Incumbent's commission expires May 26, 1940.

James T. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Glen Head, N. Y., in place of J. T. McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

Jerry Burd to be postmaster at Greenwood, N. Y., in place of Jerry Burd. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

John F. Richards to be postmaster at Hammondsport, N. Y., in place of J. F. Richards. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Abner B. Woodworth to be postmaster at Hensonville, N. Y., in place of A. B. Woodworth. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

George J. Petith to be postmaster at Hillsdale, N. Y., in place of G. J. Petith. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Laura F. Howland to be postmaster at Hudson Falls, N. Y., in place of A. W. Howland, deceased.

William H. Toohey to be postmaster at Hurleyville, N. Y., in place of W. H. Toohey. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Frederick W. Schadt to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, N. Y., in place of F. W. Schadt. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1940.

Anna M. Shemet to be postmaster at Keene Valley, N. Y., in place of M. A. Crawford, removed.

Earl A. Guertin to be postmaster at Lakewood, N. Y., in place of E. A. Guertin. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Walter E. Slattery to be postmaster at Lima, N. Y., in place of W. E. Slattery. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1940.

James Case to be postmaster at Little Valley, N. Y., in place of James Case. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Michael E. Murphy to be postmaster at Livonia, N. Y., in place of M. E. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Frank McBriarty to be postmaster at Loomis, N. Y., in place of Frank McBriarty. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Katherine A. Slattery to be postmaster at Maryknoll, N. Y., in place of K. A. Slattery. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Frederic F. Sheerin to be postmaster at Middletown, N. Y., in place of F. F. Sheerin. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

William C. McRorie to be postmaster at Milford, N. Y., in place of W. C. McRorie. Incumbent's commission expires May 26, 1940.

Oliver L. Sause to be postmaster at Mineola, N. Y., in place of O. L. Sause. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

William McNeal to be postmaster at Montgomery, N. Y., in place of William McNeal. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1939.

Ralph S. Washington to be postmaster at Monticello, N. Y., in place of R. S. Washington. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

William E. Mensing to be postmaster at Nassau, N. Y., in place of W. E. Mensing. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Harriett H. Rundle to be postmaster at Odessa, N. Y., in place of H. H. Rundle. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

John Kenneth Hoffman to be postmaster at Old Forge, N. Y., in place of J. K. Hoffman. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

J. Frederick Collins to be postmaster at Oriskany Falls, N. Y., in place of J. F. Collins. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Thomas A. Kenney to be postmaster at Ossining, N. Y., in place of T. A. Kenney. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1940.

Katherine S. Wolosik to be postmaster at Peconic, N. Y., in place of K. S. Wolosik. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Victor S. Manchester to be postmaster at Petersburg, N. Y., in place of V. S. Manchester. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

George H. Stanton to be postmaster at Pine Bush, N. Y., in place of G. H. Stanton. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1940.

James Earle Molyneux to be postmaster at Ransomville, N. Y., in place of J. E. Molyneux. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Irma R. Bennett to be postmaster at Ripley, N. Y., in place of I. R. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Maurice H. Fanning to be postmaster at Roxbury, N. Y., in place of M. H. Fanning. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Timothy V. Sullivan to be postmaster at St. James, N. Y., in place of T. V. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

George Arata to be postmaster at Sea Cliff, N. Y., in place of George Arata. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1939.

William A. Flanagan to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in place of W. A. Flanagan. Incumbent's commission expires May 26, 1940.

Alice A. Sherman to be postmaster at Shelter Island, N. Y., in place of A. A. Sherman. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Mary P. Mack to be postmaster at Shelter Island Heights, N. Y., in place of A. K. Dickson, removed.

Willis Meabon to be postmaster at Sherman, N. Y., in place of Willis Meabon. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Walter F. Herrling to be postmaster at Skaneateles, N. Y., in place of W. F. Herrling. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1940.

E. Edward DeCamp to be postmaster at Smallwood, N. Y., in place of E. E. DeCamp. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1940.

Monte Yost to be postmaster at Springville, N. Y., in place of Monte Yost. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Sarah C. Lounsbury to be postmaster at Stone Ridge, N. Y., in place of S. C. Lounsbury. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

William Cronin to be postmaster at Yonkers, N. Y., in place of William Cronin. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

NORTH CAROLINA

Joseph A. Leigh to be postmaster at Belhaven, N. C., in place of J. A. Leigh. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1940.

Grover C. Haynes to be postmaster at Clyde, N. C., in place of G. C. Haynes. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Trixie M. Matthews to be postmaster at Engelhard, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1939.

Angus Raymond McRacken to be postmaster at Kenly, N. C., in place of A. R. McRacken. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Robert Boyd Patterson to be postmaster at Littleton, N. C., in place of R. B. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expires June 8, 1940.

Janie C. Norfleet to be postmaster at Roxobel, N. C., in place of J. C. Norfleet. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

John Locke Milholland to be postmaster at Statesville, N. C., in place of J. L. Milholland. Incumbent's commission expires July 7, 1940.

Frank L. Nixon to be postmaster at Sunbury, N. C., in place of F. L. Nixon. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

NORTH DAKOTA

Claude L. Arildson to be postmaster at Alexander, N. Dak., in place of C. L. Arildson. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Harvey W. Emanuel to be postmaster at Berthold, N. Dak., in place of H. W. Emanuel. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Roald B. Halvorson to be postmaster at Buxton, N. Dak., in place of R. B. Halvorson. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Arthur C. Pagenkopf to be postmaster at Dickinson, N. Dak., in place of A. C. Pagenkopf. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Arthur E. Bean to be postmaster at Donnybrook, N. Dak., in place of A. E. Bean. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Francis Higgins to be postmaster at Dunseith, N. Dak., in place of Francis Higgins. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Florence M. Law to be postmaster at Halliday, N. Dak., in place of F. M. Law. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Harold J. Rock to be postmaster at Hamilton, N. Dak., in place of H. J. Rock. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1940.

Elmer Knorr to be postmaster at Hunter, N. Dak., in place of Elmer Knorr. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Herman E. Moyes to be postmaster at Oberon, N. Dak., in place of H. E. Moyes. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

James W. Thomson to be postmaster at Turtle Lake, N. Dak., in place of J. M. Thomson. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1940.

OHIO

James M. McClure to be postmaster at Ashtabula, Ohio, in place of J. M. McClure. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1940.

Earl C. Hillyer to be postmaster at Atwater, Ohio, in place of E. C. Hillyer. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1940.

Albert P. Hahn to be postmaster at Baltic, Ohio, in place of A. P. Hahn. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1940.

Anna L. Adams to be postmaster at Beaver, Ohio, in place of A. L. Adams. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

William P. Ziegler to be postmaster at Belle Center, Ohio, in place of W. P. Ziegler. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1940.

Ferdinand J. Lenhart to be postmaster at Botkins, Ohio, in place of F. J. Lenhart. Incumbent's commission expires July 13, 1940.

Rollo C. Witwer to be postmaster at Akron, Ohio, in place of R. C. Witwer. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1940.

Jeanette Long to be postmaster at Brunswick, Ohio, in place of Jeanette Long. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1940.

Ervin J. Ostermyer to be postmaster at Chatfield, Ohio, in place of E. J. Ostermyer. Incumbent's commission expires July 13, 1940.

Francis P. Hayes to be postmaster at Crestline, Ohio, in place of F. P. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1940.

Cleo B. Brockman to be postmaster at Fort Jennings, Ohio, in place of C. B. Brockman. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

William H. McConaha to be postmaster at Fort Recovery, Ohio, in place of W. H. McConaha. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Walter Miller to be postmaster at Germantown, Ohio, in place of O. R. Stroup. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

Charles W. Zeller to be postmaster at Gibsonburg, Ohio, in place of C. W. Zeller. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1940.

Thomas H. Mulvey to be postmaster at Girard, Ohio, in place of T. H. Mulvey. Incumbent's commission expired March 12, 1940.

Hattie E. Lewis to be postmaster at Greenwich, Ohio, in place of H. E. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

John Hayden Kohn to be postmaster at Grover Hill, Ohio, in place of J. H. Kohn. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1940.

Earle V. Miller to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Ohio, in place of E. V. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

John J. Boyle to be postmaster at Hubbard, Ohio, in place of J. J. Boyle. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

Viola L. Wisnieski to be postmaster at Independence, Ohio, in place of V. L. Wisnieski. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

William N. Long to be postmaster at Kingsville, Ohio, in place of W. N. Long. Incumbent's commission expired July 22, 1939.

Irene A. Francescon to be postmaster at Leavittsburg, Ohio, in place of I. A. Francescon. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

James E. Warren to be postmaster at McArthur, Ohio, in place of J. E. Warren. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

Ann W. Knotts to be postmaster at Magnolia, Ohio, in place of A. W. Knotts. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Harry H. Hart to be postmaster at Malvern, Ohio, in place of H. H. Hart. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1940.

Robert W. Guteruth to be postmaster at Mason, Ohio, in place of R. W. Guteruth. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

William D. Goodwin to be postmaster at Masury, Ohio, in place of W. D. Goodwin. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

Gladys E. Sperry to be postmaster at Middlefield, Ohio, in place of G. E. Sperry. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Fred J. Lawler to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ohio, in place of F. J. Lawler. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

Leroy B. Griffith to be postmaster at Newton Falls, Ohio, in place of L. B. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Jessie W. Graham to be postmaster at North Fairfield, Ohio, in place of J. W. Graham. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Chester L. Jones to be postmaster at Otway, Ohio, in place of C. L. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Cary B. Holycross to be postmaster at Plain City, Ohio, in place of C. B. Holycross. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1940.

Claude E. Sourwine to be postmaster at Plymouth, Ohio, in place of C. E. Sourwine. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

George L. Gableman to be postmaster at Portsmouth, Ohio, in place of G. L. Gableman. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Estella Holter to be postmaster at Racine, Ohio, in place of Estella Holter. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1940.

Loretta H. Duswald to be postmaster at Scio, Ohio, in place of L. H. Duswald. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

Clara L. Hewit to be postmaster at Seville, Ohio, in place of C. L. Hewit. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1940.

Homer W. Rider to be postmaster at Spencerville, Ohio, in place of H. W. Rider. Incumbent's commission expires July 15, 1940.

Charles Norman Wenzlau to be postmaster at Tipp City, Ohio, in place of C. N. Wenzlau. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1940.

Julius L. Snyder to be postmaster at Tiro, Ohio, in place of J. L. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1940.

Thornton A. Hassler to be postmaster at West Liberty, Ohio, in place of T. A. Hassler. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

Henry Provo to be postmaster at Wickliffe, Ohio, in place of Henry Provo. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Michael A. Delsantro to be postmaster at Willoughby, Ohio, in place of M. A. Delsantro. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1940.

Mahara D. Barns to be postmaster at Wilmington, Ohio, in place of M. D. Barns. Incumbent's commission expires June 19, 1940.

OKLAHOMA

Marcus L. Jarvis to be postmaster at Arapaho, Okla., in place of M. L. Jarvis. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

John A. King to be postmaster at Asher, Okla., in place of O. L. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1940.

Glenn D. Burns to be postmaster at Dover, Okla., in place of G. D. Burns. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Ernest C. Morris to be postmaster at Drumright, Okla., in place of E. C. Morris. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1940.

Lewis B. Rogers to be postmaster at Fort Gibson, Okla., in place of L. B. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

Howard R. Wynn to be postmaster at Fort Towson, Okla., in place of H. R. Wynn. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

James W. Kincaid to be postmaster at Glencoe, Okla., in place of J. W. Kincaid. Incumbent's commission expires June 2, 1940.

Virgil A. Little to be postmaster at Goodwell, Okla., in place of V. A. Little. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Charles Williams to be postmaster at Hooker, Okla., in place of Charles Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1940.

Ernest R. Davis to be postmaster at Keota, Okla., in place of E. R. Davis. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

Blanche Zoellner to be postmaster at Mountain View, Okla., in place of Blanche Zoellner. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

Frank R. Hendrickson to be postmaster at Quinton, Okla., in place of F. R. Hendrickson. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Anna Wilcox to be postmaster at Seiling, Okla., in place of Anna Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Eleanor Barnhill to be postmaster at Stringtown, Okla., in place of Eleanor Barnhill. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1940.

Lester F. Wray to be postmaster at Terral, Okla., in place of L. F. Wray. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Roy C. Bennett to be postmaster at Vian, Okla., in place of R. C. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1940.

Frank Bailey to be postmaster at Vinita, Okla., in place of Frank Bailey. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

Theodore H. Henderson to be postmaster at Wapanucka, Okla., in place of T. H. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expired August 13, 1939.

OREGON

John B. Wade to be postmaster at Bandon, Oreg., in place of J. B. Wade. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Henry J. Atlee to be postmaster at Banks, Oreg., in place of H. J. Atlee. Incumbent's commission expired March 12, 1940.

Delbert E. Pearson to be postmaster at Carlton, Oreg., in place of D. E. Pearson. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1940.

Margaret M. R. Calendine to be postmaster at Cascade Locks, Oreg., in place of M. M. R. Calendine. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1940.

Arlena Kuhn to be postmaster at Dundee, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1939.

Eldon A. Rush to be postmaster at Elgin, Oreg., in place of E. A. Rush. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

William G. Hoover to be postmaster at Fossil, Oreg., in place of W. G. Hoover. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

Sanford Stanley Partridge to be postmaster at Garibaldi, Oreg., in place of S. S. Partridge. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1940.

Cecil G. Colby to be postmaster at Gervais, Oreg., in place of C. G. Colby. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Irwin D. Pike to be postmaster at Grass Valley, Oreg., in place of I. D. Pike. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

Lemuel T. McPheeters to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Oreg., in place of L. T. McPheeters. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1940.

Lawrence G. Allen to be postmaster at Joseph, Oreg., in place of L. G. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Thomas B. Hoover to be postmaster at Kinsua, Oreg., in place of T. B. Hoover. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1940.

Merrill V. Smith to be postmaster at Lebanon, Oreg., in place of M. V. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Sidney B. Powers to be postmaster at Molalla, Oreg., in place of S. B. Powers. Incumbent's commission expired July 9, 1939.

Rodrick A. Chisholm to be postmaster at Monroe, Oreg., in place of R. A. Chisholm. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Charles F. Cox to be postmaster at Ontario, Oreg., in place of C. F. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Percy Pope Caufield to be postmaster at Oregon City, Oreg., in place of P. P. Caufield. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1940.

Vinnie B. Lay to be postmaster at Powers, Oreg., in place of V. B. May. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1940.

Susie B. Dillard to be postmaster at St. Helens, Oreg., in place of S. B. Dillard. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1940.

William A. Rankin to be postmaster at Turner, Oreg., in place of W. A. Rankin. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

PENNSYLVANIA

Paul V. Tillard to be postmaster at Altoona, Pa., in place of A. B. Clark, removed.

Mary K. Roach to be postmaster at Bala-Cynwyd, Pa., in place of M. K. Roach. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Edward B. Walker to be postmaster at Berlin, Pa., in place of E. B. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1940.

Howard P. Schaeffer to be postmaster at Bernharts, Pa., in place of H. P. Schaeffer. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1940.

Blair L. Nagle to be postmaster at Birdsboro, Pa., in place of B. L. Nagle. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

John Brady Murrin to be postmaster at Butler, Pa., in place of L. J. Leonard, deceased.

Isaac A. Hiorth to be postmaster at Chester, Pa., in place of I. A. Hiorth. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1940.

Ruth R. Dufford to be postmaster at Clintonville, Pa., in place of R. R. Dufford. Incumbent's commission expired July 22, 1939.

James A. Modey to be postmaster at Creighton, Pa., in place of J. A. Modey. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Elijah E. Hall to be postmaster at Elizabeth, Pa., in place of E. E. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Charles H. Schloss to be postmaster at Erie, Pa., in place of C. H. Schloss. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Chester R. Wahl to be postmaster at Evans City, Pa., in place of C. R. Wahl. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Cletus L. Goodling to be postmaster at Farm School, Pa., in place of C. L. Goodling. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Willis C. Jack to be postmaster at Freedom, Pa., in place of W. C. Jack. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Mildred E. Wagner to be postmaster at Freemansburg, Pa., in place of M. E. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expires June 3, 1940.

Harvey P. Hartman to be postmaster at Fullerton, Pa., in place of H. P. Hartman. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

John Johnston to be postmaster at Library, Pa., in place of John Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1940.

John Seibert Barclay to be postmaster at Loysville, Pa., in place of J. S. Barclay. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Daniel F. Guinan, Jr., to be postmaster at Mahanoy City, Pa., in place of D. F. Guinan, Jr. Incumbent's commission expires July 15, 1940.

Dale A. Phelps to be postmaster at Mather, Pa., in place of M. E. Courtley. Incumbent's commission expired July 3, 1939.

Enoch W. Filer to be postmaster at Mercer, Pa., in place of J. W. Byers. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1939.

Brian W. Kauffman to be postmaster at Middleburg, Pa., in place of B. W. Kauffman. Incumbent's commission expires June 3, 1940.

Genevieve C. McMahon to be postmaster at Mildred, Pa., in place of G. C. McMahon. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

R. D. Hiram Hagenbuch to be postmaster at Montgomery, Pa., in place of R. D. H. Hagenbuch. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Ellis Walter to be postmaster at New Enterprise, Pa., in place of Ellis Walter. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Charles Gubin to be postmaster at Northumberland, Pa., in place of Charles Gubin. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1939.

Clinton H. Hoffman to be postmaster at Pennsburg, Pa., in place of C. H. Hoffman. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Maurice E. Sassaman, Sr., to be postmaster at Pottstown, Pa., in place of M. E. Sassaman, Sr. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

John W. Connelly to be postmaster at Prospect Park, Pa., in place of J. W. Connelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1940.

William F. Halligan, Jr., to be postmaster at Radnor, Pa., in place of W. F. Halligan, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1940.

Paul W. Marshall to be postmaster at Rochester, Pa., in place of P. W. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Marlin W. Workman to be postmaster at Six Mile Run, Pa., in place of M. W. Workman. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Emma S. Happel to be postmaster at Tatamy, Pa., in place of E. S. Happel. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Jeane C. Lewis to be postmaster at Weedville, Pa., in place of J. C. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1939.

Florence J. McMahon to be postmaster at Wesleyville, Pa., in place of F. J. McMahon. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Edward J. Quinn to be postmaster at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in place of E. J. Quinn. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

Frank E. Plankenhorn to be postmaster at Williamsport, Pa., in place of F. E. Plankenhorn. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Henrietta T. McEvoy to be postmaster at Willow Grove, Pa., in place of H. T. McEvoy. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

Ruth A. McKenna to be postmaster at Yardley, Pa., in place of R. A. McKenna. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

PUERTO RICO

Irma E. Kryzanowsky to be postmaster at Ponce, P. R., in place of I. E. Kryzanowsky. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

RHODE ISLAND

Charles E. Cornell to be postmaster at Shannock, R. I., in place of C. E. Cornell. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

George A. Dolan to be postmaster at Westerly, R. I., in place of G. A. Dolan. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Henry N. Folk to be postmaster at Bamberg, S. C., in place of H. N. Folk. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

Pearl Youmans to be postmaster at Brunson, S. C., in place of Pearl Youmans. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

Inez S. Littlejohn to be postmaster at Jonesville, S. C., in place of I. S. Littlejohn. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

William E. Law to be postmaster at Moncks Corner, S. C., in place of W. E. Law. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Bertha D. Boatwright to be postmaster at Ridge Spring, S. C., in place of Foster Kreps, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

SOUTH DAKOTA

James T. Homme to be postmaster at Bison, S. Dak., in place of J. T. Homme. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1940.

Theodore G. Weiland to be postmaster at Bridgewater, S. Dak., in place of T. G. Weiland. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Herbert C. Hagen to be postmaster at Britton, S. Dak., in place of H. C. Hagen. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Charles Gordon Finley to be postmaster at Bryant, S. Dak., in place of C. G. Finley. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Violet Ellefson to be postmaster at Castlewood, S. Dak., in place of Violet Ellefson. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Hollis M. Hill to be postmaster at De Smet, S. Dak., in place of H. M. Hill. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Thomas H. Ryan to be postmaster at Elk Point, S. Dak., in place of T. H. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Joseph A. Conlon to be postmaster at Faulkton, S. Dak., in place of J. A. Conlon. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Albert A. Schmidt to be postmaster at Freeman, S. Dak., in place of A. A. Schmidt. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Clyde V. Hill to be postmaster at Highmore, S. Dak., in place of C. V. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1940.

John T. Schneider to be postmaster at Lebanon, S. Dak., in place of J. T. Schneider. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1940.

Fred J. Hepperle to be postmaster at Leola, S. Dak., in place of F. J. Hepperle. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Arthur A. Kluckman to be postmaster at Mound City, S. Dak., in place of A. A. Kluckman. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

John Loesch to be postmaster at Oldham, S. Dak., in place of John Loesch. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Olga R. Otis to be postmaster at Pierpont, S. Dak., in place of O. R. Otis. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Harvey J. Seim to be postmaster at Revillo, S. Dak., in place of H. J. Seim. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

Albert H. Fogel to be postmaster at Rosholt, S. Dak., in place of A. H. Fogel. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Agnes Parker to be postmaster at Timber Lake, S. Dak., in place of Agnes Parker. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

William A. Bauman to be postmaster at Vermillion, S. Dak., in place of W. A. Bauman. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Clarence J. LaBarge to be postmaster at Wakonda, S. Dak., in place of C. J. LaBarge. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Marion Peterson to be postmaster at Waubay, S. Dak., in place of Marion Peterson. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Frank B. Kargleder to be postmaster at White Rock, S. Dak., in place of F. B. Kargleder. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

TENNESSEE

Nathan D. Guy to be postmaster at Bradford, Tenn., in place of N. D. Guy. Incumbent's commission expires July 13, 1940.

George Reed Canada to be postmaster at Dyer, Tenn., in place of G. R. Canada. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Ruth G. McCollum to be postmaster at Greenback, Tenn., in place of R. G. McCollum. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Hugh B. Milstead to be postmaster at Hornsby, Tenn., in place of H. B. Milstead. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Joe F. Penn to be postmaster at Kenton, Tenn., in place of J. F. Penn. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Frank F. Kelley to be postmaster at Lake City, Tenn., in place of R. K. Branscom, resigned.

John W. Simpson to be postmaster at Loudon, Tenn., in place of J. W. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Edgar D. Hagan to be postmaster at Redboiling Springs, Tenn., in place of E. D. Hagan. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Lyle S. Alexander to be postmaster at Ridgely, Tenn., in place of L. S. Alexander. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

TEXAS

Ray E. Lee to be postmaster at Austin, Tex., in place of Ewell Nalle. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1939.

Rena Hurst Cox to be postmaster at Bellevue, Tex., in place of R. H. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1940.

James Harley Dallas, to be postmaster at Brownfield, Tex., in place of J. H. Dallas. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1940.

Wilson Bradley to be postmaster at Bryan, Tex., in place of Wilson Bradley. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Eugene Webb to be postmaster at Corrigan, Tex., in place of Eugene Webb. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1940.

Sidney Tate Counts to be postmaster at De Leon, Tex., in place of R. L. Scott, resigned.

Walter E. McRee to be postmaster at Eagle Lake, Tex., in place of J. H. Moyers. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Jerome H. Moyers to be postmaster at Ferris, Tex., in place of J. H. Moyers. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Vera Harris to be postmaster at Forsan, Tex., in place of Vera Harris. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Iva Edith Koonce to be postmaster at Ganado, Tex., in place of Edith Koonce. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Hugh P. English to be postmaster at Kennard, Tex., in place of H. P. English. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

James F. Mitchell to be postmaster at Lancaster, Tex., in place of J. F. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Llanos M. Laird to be postmaster at Lorenzo, Tex., in place of L. M. Laird. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

John L. Spencer to be postmaster at Mart, Tex., in place of Edwin Westbrook, resigned.

Geneva M. Michael to be postmaster at May, Tex., in place of G. M. Michael. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Irene M. King to be postmaster at Neches, Tex., in place of Irene King. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Sarah O. Beaver to be postmaster at Queen City, Tex., in place of S. O. Beaver. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Janie W. Chandler to be postmaster at Smiley, Tex., in place of J. W. Chandler. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

John Morgan Hall to be postmaster at Stanton, Tex., in place of J. M. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

William B. Richardson to be postmaster at Telephone, Tex., in place of W. B. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Andrew S. Tarpley to be postmaster at Truscott, Tex., in place of A. S. Tarpley. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Allen H. Brandt to be postmaster at Wallis, Tex., in place of A. H. Brandt. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Elmer Rice to be postmaster at Wilson, Tex., in place of Elmer Rice. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

UTAH

Vernal Twede to be postmaster at Payson, Utah, in place of Vernal Twede. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

John Emmett Bird to be postmaster at Springville, Utah, in place of J. E. Bird. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

VERMONT

Charles F. Mann to be postmaster at Brattleboro, Vt., in place of C. F. Mann. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Alfred P. Lonergan to be postmaster at Essex Junction, Vt., in place of A. P. Lonergan. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

James McGovern to be postmaster at North Bennington, Vt., in place of James McGovern. Incumbent's commission expires June 16, 1940.

Owen W. McShane to be postmaster at Poultney, Vt., in place of O. W. McShane. Incumbent's commission expires June 20, 1940.

VIRGINIA

Charles P. Graham to be postmaster at Bridgewater, Va., in place of O. W. Miller, deceased.

Mae R. Bostick to be postmaster at Burkeville, Va., in place of M. R. Bostick. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Garland W. Spratley to be postmaster at Dendron, Va., in place of G. W. Spratley. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Walter S. Wilson to be postmaster at Raphine, Va., in place of W. S. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Lawrence Hottle to be postmaster at Toms Brook, Va., in place of Lawrence Hottle. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

Lillian C. Ruff to be postmaster at Vienna, Va., in place of L. C. Ruff. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

WASHINGTON

Almon D. Hannan to be postmaster at Bothell, Wash., in place of A. D. Hannan. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1940.

Elliot Curry to be postmaster at Colville, Wash., in place of Elliot Curry. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Regina M. Mohrmann to be postmaster at Ferndale, Wash., in place of R. M. Mohrmann. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

John M. Hurley to be postmaster at La Conner, Wash., in place of J. M. Hurley. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1940.

Esther H. Boaz to be postmaster at Manson, Wash., in place of E. H. Boaz. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Thomas Phil Hickman to be postmaster at Monroe, Wash., in place of T. P. Hickman. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

Howard C. Roberts to be postmaster at Rosalia, Wash., in place of H. C. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Alf Christian Willard to be postmaster at Stanwood, Wash., in place of A. C. Willard. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

WEST VIRGINIA

Carroll Miller to be postmaster at Gauley Bridge, W. Va., in place of Carroll Miller. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Asa T. Miller to be postmaster at Madison, W. Va., in place of A. T. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Frederick F. Robey to be postmaster at Shinnston, W. Va., in place of F. F. Robey. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Delpha C. Stemple to be postmaster at Thomas, W. Va., in place of D. C. Stemple. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

Jock L. Henderson to be postmaster at Williamstown, W. Va., in place of J. L. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1940.

WISCONSIN

Fred V. Starry to be postmaster at Barneveld, Wis., in place of F. V. Starry. Incumbent's commission expires June 17, 1940.

John C. Kiley to be postmaster at Fond du Lac, Wis., in place of J. C. Kiley. Incumbent's commission expires June 18, 1940.

Evelyn Wotruba to be postmaster at Milladore, Wis., in place of J. K. Wotruba, deceased.

John A. Fleissner to be postmaster at Milwaukee, Wis., in place of J. A. Fleissner. Incumbent's commission expires June 19, 1940.

WYOMING

Orville R. Booker to be postmaster at Basin, Wyo., in place of O. R. Booker. Incumbent's commission expires June 1, 1940.

Austin R. Craven to be postmaster at Sunrise, Wyo., in place of A. R. Craven. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1940.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 24 (legislative day of April 24), 1940

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Ambrose O'Connell to be First Assistant Postmaster General.

Smith W. Purdum to be Second Assistant Postmaster General.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Dennis A. Phelan to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 12, with headquarters at Pittsburgh, Pa.

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Bailey M. Wells, Campo.
James L. Grant, Clifton.
Arthur S. Gustafson, Fort Lupton.
Clinton C. Bell, Limon.
Charles Leonard Drage, Lyons.
Charles M. Burrell, New Castle.
Henry C. Showalter, Olathe.
James M. McLearn, Rifle.
William C. Lowery, Sedgwick.
Meryl D. Haynes, Seibert.
Floyd E. Cooper, Silverton.
Raymond L. Ford, Vona.
George A. May, Windsor.

CONNECTICUT

Mary E. Johnson, Berlin.
George B. Moroney, Collinsville.
Arthur A. Lawrence, East Berlin.
Florence W. Latham, Eastford.
William S. Meany, Greenwich.
Nina P. Hudson Arnold, Haddam.
Edmond J. Jodoin, Jewett City.
William W. Fagan, Kensington.
Martin J. Donahue, Litchfield.
John J. Scanlon, Meriden.
Catharine W. Quinlan, North Haven.
James C. Bransfield, Portland.
Arthur W. Carmody, Sandy Hook.
Nelson E. Welch, Somers.
Warren A. Mansfield, Woodbury.
J. Edward LaCroix, Yalesville.

DELAWARE

James J. Cahill, Wilmington.

FLORIDA

Otis E. Padgett, Marianna.
Edgar Drew Padgett, Ponce de Leon.

GEORGIA

Evelyn W. Simpson, Buford.
Sara B. Fox, Harlem.
Colquitt G. Russell, Kingsland.
Kate Harris, Leesburg.
Sara S. Buchanan, Locust Grove.
Joseph C. Williams, Lyerly.
William W. Baldwin, Madison.
Anna Morrison, Mount Vernon.
Robert C. Ayers, Royston.
Sadie W. Sutton, Shellman.
Walter R. Hall, Young Harris.

HAWAII

Julia Smythe, Haiku.
Kenichi Masunaga, Kealia.

INDIANA

Morris A. Draper, Amboy.
Mary Rutledge, Beech Grove.
Wilburdine G. Smith, Brookston.
Ruth M. Huddleston, Brownsburg.
John S. Kriegbaum, Churubusco.
Willard F. Edmonson, Clayton.
Bertha Higgins, Danville.
Frank M. Davis, Fort Branch.
Jack Dolan, Hartford City.
Alton C. Reeves, Hope.
John G. Harding, Kirklint.
Fred Porter Rensberger, Lakeville.
Fred Finney, Martinsville.
Susan Mae Fattic, Middletown.
Melvin Woods, Milroy.
Ruth D. Pommerehn, North Madison.
Vance E. Worrell, Orleans.
Stephen A. Blood, Jr., Owensville.
John N. Bonifas, Portland.
John E. McFarland, Ridgeville.

Charles F. Fisher, Speed.
 Harry L. Korner, Star City.
 Roy Beck, Tipton.
 Rollin J. Clark, Topeka.
 Thelma F. Shuff, Van Buren.
 Faye C. Winsor, Versailles.
 Thomas H. Cartmel, Waldron.
 Russell J. Dunn, Waterloo.
 Ruby G. Nusbaum, Winona Lake.
 Don W. Workman, Worthington.
 Perry R. Moore, Zionsville.

KENTUCKY

Charles F. Vest, Berry.
 Daniel S. Mitchell, Crofton.
 Gilbert Adams, Flemingsburg.
 Mary Elvira Johnson, Kevil.
 George J. Covington, Mayfield.
 William M. Back, Monticello.
 Gemmill Baker Senff, Mount Sterling.
 Carroll E. Withers, Providence.
 John A. Gross, Vine Grove.

MAINE

Ralph H. Egan, Ashland.
 Tobias L. Roberts, Bar Harbor.
 Herbert Fred Hanson, Belfast.
 Fred S. Littlefield, Brooks.
 Anna M. McCann, Bucksport.
 Adrian F. Kelleher, Camden.
 Charles W. Richardson, Jr., Castine.
 Geneva B. Haley, Cornish.
 Perl E. Woodbury, Damariscotta.
 Frank X. Oakes, Fairfield.
 William Gerald Jordan, Fryeburg.
 Marita E. Peabody, Houlton.
 Odellie Duperry, Keegan.
 William D. Hay, Kennebunk.
 Natt R. Hubbard, Kittery.
 Paul Archambault, Madawaska.
 Delta F. Smith, Mapleton.
 Bess M. Clark, Milo.
 William S. Holmes, Northeast Harbor.
 Spellman C. Marshall, Oakland.
 George R. Desjardins, Old Town.
 Fred W. Allen, Pownal.
 Philip B. Seavey, Sherman Mills.
 Louis S. Marquis, Springvale.
 Allston M. Hatch, Stonington.
 Harold T. Ricker, Stratton.
 Roy E. Swaney, Vanceboro.
 George C. Robinson, Westbrook.
 Francis Philip Foley, Winterport.
 Harry Clair Miller, Winthrop.
 Edward C. Bridges, York Village.

NEW YORK

Howard C. Gould, Alfred.
 Frances K. Jude, Angelica.
 John F. McGrath, Auburn.
 John R. Clements, Bible School Park.
 Michael L. Sullivan, Binghamton.
 Warren Scott, Canajoharie.
 Carl L. Baker, Candor.
 Perley M. Hall, Carthage.
 Jesse B. Kilburn, Cattaraugus.
 Edward M. Turley, Clayville.
 Kingsley D. Maloy, Clyde.
 George F. Elwood, Cold Spring Harbor.
 Irma R. Chapman, Dewittville.
 George A. Rackett, Greenport.
 Dorothea E. Blum, Hawthorne.
 Glen S. McBratney, Heuvelton.
 Allen M. Nesbitt, Jordan.
 Ray G. Blyth, Macedon.
 Thomas J. Fay, Massena.
 Frank B. Rickard, Middleburg.
 John Francis Dawson, Mineville.

Pearl P. McGuire, Nedrow.
 Joseph C. Walter, New Rochelle.
 John H. Tanney, Newtonville.
 Kittie M. Lundergun, North Rose.
 Herbert N. Griffin, Oxford.
 John V. Lynch, Pearl River.
 Robert L. Decker, Rhinebeck.
 Henry J. Baker, St. Regis Falls.
 Myra A. Barber, Sanborn.
 Anna Fallon, Setauket.
 Robert W. Siver, Sidney.
 Charles A. Gagen, Southhold.
 Amy B. Earley, Speculator.
 Frederick N. Brown, Jr., Stephentown.
 Edith C. Jones, Tappan.
 Mabel E. Fausette, Trumansburg.
 Harry S. New, Valatie.
 Francis J. McCarthy, Watertown.
 David J. Young, Westhampton.
 Mary A. Scesny, Yaphank.

RHODE ISLAND

James J. Martin, Newport.
 Thomas D. Goldrick, Pascoag.
 Antonio Prince, Woonsocket.

WISCONSIN

Clarence T. Dolan, Abbotsford.
 Marie Freeman, Bayfield.
 William H. Hannan, Blue River.
 Charles G. Pagel, Brandon.
 Carl Newton, De Forest.
 Victoria St. Angelo, Frederic.
 Harold P. Van Buren, Hartland.
 Karl C. Neubauer, Horicon.
 Anal E. Lennon, Hurley.
 Richard H. McCarty, Kaukauna.
 Fred C. Wolff, Lakemills.
 Emil L. Silverness, Mondovi.
 August W. Frisch, New Holstein.
 Jacob Werner, New London.
 Amos T. Green, Niagara.
 Clara A. E. Manion, Oregon.
 Jennie C. Thomm, Oxford.
 John W. Schnettler, Saint Nazianz.
 Charles J. Morris, Sharon.
 Louis J. Albrecht, Sheboygan.
 William H. Shay, Somerset.
 Allison L. McNeight, Stratford.
 Charles F. Kurtz, Two Rivers.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 24, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, fill us with Thy love today, love for the truth, love for the ideals of purity and righteousness. Baptize us with the spirit of the Master and send us forth to our appointed tasks with a brightening, gladdening influence to cheer and strengthen any weary heart that we may meet in our day's journey. O God, at the altar of prayer may we adjust ourselves and have Thy presence about the circuit of our labors. Good Shepherd, we praise Thee that through all the length of days, Thy goodness never faileth. We pray that by the discipline of Thy Providence, we may hold ourselves calmly balanced, well-ordered, and rightly governed amid emotions, agitations, and provocations. Let them not be able to shake us from the steadfast purpose of self-government. Speed the great and glorious hour when the Lord shall shine forth and there shall be no night, but the glory of the Lord shall reign upon the earth as the sun in the heavens. For every fear the Christ presents a promise and for every suspicion He offers an assurance. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8438. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRNES, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HALE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, when the relief bill was passed, I happened to be in the Chair so was precluded from making this announcement. My colleagues the gentlemen from North Carolina, Mr. BARDEN, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. DURHAM, and Mr. WEAVER were unavoidably absent. Had they been present they would have voted "yea."

MOLLIE V. RAPEE

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 500

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mollie V. Rapee, widow of Charles Albert Rapee, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount not to exceed \$250, to defray funeral expenses of the said Charles Albert Rapee.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by the Reverend Linus A. Lilly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Arthur Krock, of the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial relating to amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROUTZOHN]?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 of the California State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to address you this morning in connection with Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 enacted by the Legislature of California, unanimously by the senate and by a vote of 59 to 8 in the assembly, dealing with nazi-ism and communism in the United States.

This joint resolution reads as follows:

Whereas Lenin, in his book entitled "State and Revolution," declares that "democracy is a form of the state—one of its varieties"; and

Engles, in his book entitled "Internationales aux des Volkstaad," declares that—

"The party (the Communist Party) whose economic program is not merely Socialist in general but directly communistic, and whose ultimate political aim is to overcome the whole state and therefore democracy as well"; and

The program of the Communist International states:

"The conquest of power by the proletariat is the violent overthrow of bourgeois power, the destruction of the capitalist state apparatus (bourgeois, army, police, bureaucratic hierarchy, the judiciary, parliament, etc.), and substituting in its place new organs of proletarian power." * * * and

Whereas the Communist Party of the United States, although affiliated with the International, has adopted the Trojan-horse policy suggested by Georgi Dimitrov in a report to the International in August 1935, and has deleted all references to violence and conquest in its new constitution in order to deceive the American people; and

This policy is declared to be the realization in practice of Dimitrov's instructions to learn as quickly as possible how to sail on the turbulent waters of class struggle; and

The Communist Party is seeking to accomplish its objective in the United States by breeding disrespect for American democracy and all that it represents, and by sabotaging American labor and industry; and

It is undeniably true that the ultimate aim of subversive elements, as exemplified in the United States by the Communist and Nazi groups, is to destroy democracy and establish a totalitarian state; and

The Communist and Nazi groups are attempting to discredit the President's peace and preparedness program in order to involve the United States in the present European war on the side of the dictator partnership of Hitler and Stalin; and

The United States may eventually be the victim of a "blitzkrieg" by Stalinism and Hitlerism; and

Whereas these termites are prepared to constitute the "fifth column" for Hitler and Stalin in the event of a "blitzkrieg" by these monsters; and

Whereas communism and nazi-ism constitute the greatest threats to democracy, civil liberties, human freedom, and the welfare of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California jointly, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully urged to study means and methods of completely and effectively stamping out the traitorous Communist Party and Nazi groups in the United States and all other subversive organizations and to enact such legislation in connection therewith as is necessary or desirable; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby respectfully requested to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, which Senators and Representatives are hereby respectfully urged to support such legislation, and to the Attorney General of the United States, to William Green, and to John L. Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I direct the Members' particular attention to this. I hope they will read the resolution because I believe it is very timely.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a statement in regard to some failures in democracy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a short article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of May 22, 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS]?

There was no objection.

CHILD LABOR

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to include in my remarks a letter from the general secretary of the National Child Labor Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I objected on two occasions to the unanimous consent request for the consideration of the bill, S. 3237. The second time two others joined me in objecting, and seven or eight others on both sides were on their feet to object. A few days ago the Rules Committee brought in a rule for the consideration of that measure. This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the Rules Committee has not graciously given me a chance, at my written request, to appear in opposition to a bill, and I am at a loss to know why the bill was reported by the committee without his notifying me. I am very much distressed by this action. There seems to be some queer power behind this measure. There has been a clear violation of the child-labor law by certain sugar growers. The administration has taken a very fine position, usually, against child labor. This is exactly the opposite of what they have advocated heretofore.

Following is a letter I have received, and my reply thereto:

NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE,
New York City, May 16, 1940.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: The National Child Labor Committee favors the passage of S. 3237 in its present revised form. This committee, as you doubtless know, has been largely instrumental in the movement for regulation of child labor in the cultivation and harvesting of sugar beets. It was due primarily to our representation that child-labor provisions were introduced in the early sugar agreements and carried into the Jones-Costigan Act and later into the Sugar Act of 1937. We have followed the history of enforcement under this legislation with a great deal of interest and are continually working for its improvement.

We believe that the loss of a grower's entire subsidy through a minor infraction of the child-labor provisions of the Sugar Act may be, and in some cases is, an unduly severe penalty and that the penalty provided under S. 3237 with reference to the 1937, 1938, and 1939 crops, impartially applied, are sufficient to provide respect for the law and to deter violations.

We believe that the rigid requirement of the total loss of subsidy for a minor violation, because of the excessive penalty, may tend to bring a sharp reaction against the child-labor provisions of the act themselves which will be most unfortunate.

We hope that you agree with us in our advocacy of the passage of S. 3237.

Sincerely yours,

COURTENAY DINWIDDIE,
General Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1940.

MR. COURTENAY DINWIDDIE,

General Secretary, National Child Labor Committee,
419 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. DINWIDDIE: I am in receipt of your letter saying that you do not oppose S. 3237, and I am perplexed by your present position.

According to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, certain planters did violate the provisions of section 301-A of the Sugar Act, and did employ children under 14 in the sugar fields. For so doing they were denied the benefits of the Sugar Act.

These provisions of the Sugar Act, seeking to prohibit child labor, had your endorsement. The appropriation of funds annually to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor for the enforcement of this act since its adoption, have had your endorsement. Yet now, for reasons not apparent on the surface, you ask me, in effect, to join with you in making possible the granting of Federal funds to men who in the past have violated child-labor laws.

If you wish the child-labor provisions of the Sugar Act repealed or suspended in the future, why doesn't the National Child Labor Committee seek to have legislation to that effect introduced, and openly support it? In other words, if you feel the present law is bad, seek to have the present law changed or repealed, but don't try to pay back fines imposed for the violation of an existing law.

I am also at loss to understand your present position in view of the fact that just a short time ago I received from your organization an appeal for funds, an appeal which told of the evils of having children employed picking strawberries, harvesting tobacco,

selling newspapers. What is the factor that purifies and glorifies child labor in the sugarcane fields which does not glorify child labor in other industrialized activities?

You ask me to be guided by your advice and not oppose the repayment of fines already imposed on sugar planters for having employed children under 14, inadvertently.

With best wishes and kindest regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Mr. Speaker, to explain further what has taken place regarding this effort to pay back fines already imposed over a period of 3 years, for the violation of the Sugar Act, is contained in a bill, S. 3237, for the consideration of which a special rule has just been granted by the House Rules Committee. The fines, which took the form of withholding benefits under the Sugar Act, were imposed for 3 years on certain large plantation owners for having violated section 301-A of the act, the section which prohibits the employment of children under 14 years of age. Section 301-A, however, expressly exempts the farmer who may wish to use his own child in planting or harvest time on his own farm. It seeks merely to outlaw the vicious padrone system, under which large groups of children are practically sold to a padrone or overseer, who rents them out for profit on these large plantations. Labor, the national weekly of the railroad labor organizations, in this week's issue, tells the story of the fight to "block the bill to exploit kiddies."

The sugar growers slipped this bill through the Senate very, very quietly. Apparently they hoped to get it through the House in the same way, but by the time the bill came up on the floor of the House, its contents had become known to some of the Members, and we determined that this bill, seeking to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, so as, in effect, to permit the exploitation of young children in the sugar fields of this country must not be allowed to pass. It is unconscionable to use our Government's money to reward the sugar plantation owners who violated the law and employed children under 14 years of age.

When the Sugar Act was passed, many of us were happy with the feature of this act which the late Senator Edward P. Costigan had been able to have inserted, a provision that our Government was to use its economic strength to stop the vicious exploitation of children on the sugarcane fields; no grower who employed children under 14 years was to be given grants from our Government. But certain planters ignored this and did employ little girls and little boys under 14; employed them while millions of adults with hungry families went unemployed. For so doing they were denied the benefits under the Sugar Act. However, they were determined to have both our Government's money to be paid sugar growers for not employing little girls and little boys, and the right to employ them. So these plantation interests had a bill put through the Senate quickly and very quietly, which authorized giving them the back payment of benefits lost because they had exploited children. They sought similar quick and quiet action in the House. But by this time the words of this law had become known to mothers who care for the well-being of children, of all children, even poor children in the sugar fields. So the National Congress of Parents and Teachers in session at its annual convention in Omaha wired Congress not to let this bill pass until they, the mothers, had had a chance at a public hearing to tell America of the real purpose of this bill. The Y. W. C. A. also wired Congress asking for a hearing at which they could plead for America's children. Of course, labor groups sent in their protests from all corners of this country, for they were concerned not only over our Government's rewarding men for exploiting children but over our Government's rewarding growers for keeping adult men and women idle while children worked.

So when the bill was first called up under unanimous consent on Monday, May 6, I objected to its consideration, and it was passed over temporarily. Renewed effort was made for its consideration by sugar growers on May 20. But again it was objected to, this time by a larger group of Members. Those few growers who believe in exploiting chil-

dren under 14, and those persons who wished to protect their interests then decided to get a special rule for the special consideration of this bill. The special rule which has been granted them would limit debate on the measure and would prevent full consideration of this bill, which seeks to pay back fines already imposed for the offense committed, the offense of exploiting children under 14.

The report on the bill is an ironic paradox. It says that—

In administering the act, a number of cases have been found in which children under age—under 14—were employed or permitted to work on farms, although the producers apparently did not know that the children were under age and used reasonable precautions to ascertain the facts.

The report then continues, to state that because producers had limited crop production, they should be given back payments and should not—

Suffer a hardship by reason of the withholding of payments because of inadvertent child-labor violations.

If it is merely inadvertent to employ a 10-year old child instead of an unemployed man or woman, then should we not frankly repeal all child-labor provisions and stop the sham of paying thousands and thousands of dollars annually to the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor for its supposed work in preventing the exploitation of children in industry?

This report on this bill says that because the present-day Simon Legree did not know or could not help employing children he should be fined \$10 and given the hundreds of thousands of dollars to men who have been denied these large sums because they had violated the law. Now, I should ask the sponsors of this bill, Will those administering this law be able to learn of inadvertence for which a \$10 fine is to be imposed if they cannot learn of these inadvertencies if benefits of large sums are to be held back?

To me the answer is clear. Either we must deny benefits under the Sugar Act to any Simon Legree who employs children under 14 or we should, in common decency and as an act of public honesty, frankly admit that we condone the employment of children by sugarcane growers if there is enough money in it for these few powerful growers. I am determined not to let us admit the latter; I am determined to fight for the freedom of American children in sugarcane fields and everywhere, and in this fight I have the active support of the finest groups in this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman complains that she was not notified that the Rules Committee was to hold a hearing on the bill to which she referred. When the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Mouton] appeared in behalf of that Senate bill I was informed that the bill had been unanimously reported, and that all the departments agreed that very little was involved. The representatives of the minority party were present and they were satisfied. I had no knowledge just then, although I do recollect having received a letter, that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts had objected on the floor, but that was not a part of the record of the Committee on Rules. Consequently, the rule was granted. I assure the gentlewoman that no slight was intended as it has always been the practice of the Committee on Rules to give Members full opportunity to be heard. I believe it is a just bill. All the departments agreed that a fine of \$10 be assessed against each and every one of the sugar growers who have employed child labor by mistake, where the boys were a few months under 16. The growers have been deprived of the benefits under the Sugar Act, and that is the reason we felt the bill deserved immediate consideration.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BOLLES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a newspaper article by G. Gould Lincoln.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the majority leader a question concerning the program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it was tentatively understood that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] would bring up a resolution today under the privileges of the House to return the so-called Townsend silver bill to the Senate. I understand that that will not be brought up today. May I ask the majority leader when it will be brought up?

Mr. RAYBURN. Not before Monday. I believe that it will be brought up as one of the first matters to be considered Monday.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9850) to expedite the strengthening of the national defense; and pending that, I should like to reach an agreement as to time with the gentleman on the other side. I suggest 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. ANDREWS. The requests for time on this side are considerably in excess of what would be our portion of that time. I should like to see the general debate run for at least 3 hours.

Mr. MAY. In view of the fact that I have requests for additional time, and with the understanding with the gentleman from New York that we will expedite the debate and save any time we can on either side, I will agree to 3 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when the request was made on the day before yesterday that it be in order to bring up this bill for consideration at this time, a number of Members expressed the desire that we have plenty of time to debate this bill. Does the gentleman from Kentucky believe that 3 hours is plenty of time to debate this most important bill for national defense?

Mr. MAY. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the bill contains two short sections. It was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Military Affairs. The gentlemen on the minority side of the committee are as strongly for this bill as are those on the majority side, and they are entirely satisfied with the bill and with having 3 hours of general debate.

Mr. RICH. How does the gentleman know that the gentlemen on the minority side are in favor of placing the responsibility on the President of the United States? Why does not the Congress stay here and assume its responsibility? That is what you are supposed to do, and that is what the people back home elected you for.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] to the fact that what will probably be the controversial section of this bill, section 2, is embodied in the Army appropriation bill, on page 74, in the form of an amendment added by the Senate, which must come back to the House under the rules for debate and a vote because it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The bill will be in conference in a day or two. May I ask if it would not be agreeable to eliminate this section and discuss that feature when it comes back in the conference report on the Army appropriation bill? In my opinion, there is no reason why we should discuss the same subject on two different occasions.

Mr. MAY. I do not know what the gentleman's line of reasoning about it is, but mine is that in matters of this importance there ought to be legislative authority, instead of writing it into an appropriation bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is legislative authority, but on an appropriation bill, and under the rules the conferees are required to come back to the House for a direct vote on the section. Why debate it twice?

Mr. MAY. We do not have to debate it on the appropriation bill. We can debate it here today.

Mr. COCHRAN. We will debate it on the appropriation bill when that bill is brought back to the House whether you do so today or not.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. In answer to the gentleman from Missouri, may I say that it is proper to debate it at this time, because this is an authorization bill; it is legislation that will permit the authorization of an appropriation. So, if there is to be debate on this title II, now is the time it should be had rather than when the appropriation bill comes before the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Under the rules of the House we can have 1 hour of debate on such an amendment in the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9850) to expedite the strengthening of the national defense, with Mr. BOEHNE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement reached in the House the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 9850, as reported by your Committee on Military Affairs, contains but two sections, in the first of which the committee has provided for the temporary suspension of certain statutes.

First, we provided a suspension until June 30, 1942, of section 1136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States imposing monetary limitation on any individual project of construction. The reason for this is that under the program called for in the President's message, and provided for in the bill, it is going to be necessary for the War Department to construct numerous buildings, such as warehouses, additions to powder-production plants, impregnation plants, and other structures, which under section 1136 of the Revised Statutes could not be done except upon the

presentation of a detailed estimate of cost of expenditure and permission first obtained from the Congress, and that provision would, if retained in the statute, constitute a complete and effective obstruction to the successful execution of the program. It should be apparent to everyone that a speedy and large program as is contemplated by this legislation could not be successfully carried on without removal of this restriction, and it is but a temporary removal, and immediately upon the expiration of the time for which it is suspended it will again become operative.

The next suspension is that part of section 13a of the National Defense Act, as amended by the act of July 2, 1926, which limits the number of flying cadets in the Air Corps to 2,500, and the provision of the pending bill will authorize an average of 8,500 flying cadets per year.

The next suspension is the act of August 30, 1935, insofar as it limits the number of Air Corps Reserve officers who may be ordered to extended active duty with the Regular Army, and the third provision suspends section 1 of the act of April 3, 1939, insofar as it limits the authorized number of serviceable airplanes, airships, and free and captive balloons that may be equipped and maintained by the War Department.

The fourth proviso of the bill suspends chapters 12 and 13, title 5, United States Code, relating to the classified civil service insofar as it affects the employment of civilian employees by the War Department at the seat of Government or elsewhere, and the same proviso likewise suspends the act of August 5, 1882, which provides that no employee shall be employed at the seat of Government or be paid from any appropriation unless such employment is authorized and payment thereof provided in the law granting the appropriation. These two statutes refer particularly to civil-service rules and regulations and makes it possible for the War Department, in cases where the Civil Service Commission may not be able to promptly furnish the necessary personnel from their eligible list, for the Secretary of War to go outside the civil-service register and secure essential personnel.

I may say here that I have prepared an amendment to strike out the provision relating to the civil-service law, and that will be offered at the proper time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So it will be just as it is today?

Mr. MAY. With one exception; there is a provision in the bill that will waive those things in the event it is desired by the Secretary of War that that be done.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that today the President has the authority to do that.

Mr. MAY. The President, by Executive order, has authority to do what is being done here, but I can see no reason why the statute should not so provide.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then this is a change from the ordinary rules and regulations of the civil service. The employees would be exempted from the civil-service rules and regulations under the bill?

Mr. MAY. No; they will come under the civil-service regulations under the bill except that in the event the Secretary of War finds that there is some "fifth column" member in the War Department, he may by order of the Civil Service Commission or upon his own order, immediately and summarily get rid of him.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that provision is also in the naval bill.

Mr. MAY. I do not know. Doubtless the lady is properly informed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But the civil-service workers will be protected under this law?

Mr. MAY. Certainly. As they have always been, except "reds" or Communists will not be protected.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted. There are thousands upon thousands of eligibles in the navy yard

and arsenal registers alone. I want to make sure that they are protected. The civil service is equipped to examine applicants and the War Department wants the selections made through the civil service, I know.

Mr. MAY. The fifth proviso also relates to the provision of the Civil Service Act, and would authorize the Secretary of War to summarily discharge any person found in the service who for any reason was found to be undesirable, and is intended by the committee to reach any employee in the service who may be found to be out of sympathy with the war program or in league with any enemy of the country—in blunt language, any member of the "fifth column." We do not intend that if there be such now in the service or hereafter be found to be in the service that they shall shield or protect themselves by a provision of the civil-service law that would prohibit their discharge.

The sixth proviso suspends all existing statutory limitations of the enlisted strength in the various branches of the Regular Army, subject, however, to the maximum aggregate enlisted strength of 280,000, the number authorized by the statute commonly known as the National Defense Act.

Section 2 of the bill authorizes to be made available by appropriation to the President of the United States \$132,000,000, to be subject to his use until June 30, 1942, to enable him to provide for the emergency affecting the national security and our own defense, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including all objects and purposes specified under any appropriation available or to be made available to the War Department for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941. This section of the statute would authorize the President to furnish and make available to privately owned manufacturers and manufacturing plants any Government-owned facilities, and also provides for the procurement and training of civilian personnel in connection with the production of critical and essential items of national defense, and likewise authorizes the President to procure strategic raw materials as provided for in the act of June 7, 1939, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. This, of course, is the statute relating to public advertisement and competitive bidding applicable to all Departments of the Government.

I trust there shall be no delay in prompt passage of this legislation. We hear on all sides that democracy has failed because it cannot act with that speed that is necessary to effective action. Europe is on fire today as the powerful mechanized units of military preparedness move swiftly forward over defenseless unarmed neighbors. A withering avalanche of incendiary bombs and other deadly missiles are being poured from the skies, not merely upon opposing armies, but upon defenseless and helpless millions of refugees as they flee before the hellish gaze of bloodthirsty demons whose instruments of death and destruction darken the skies. All this moves to tears men and women who love God and humanity throughout the world. We read of the complete destruction of beautiful towns and cities, and hear of open and boastful threats that London, Europe's great metropolis, will be blown off the map. The English House of Lords, in the short space of 150 minutes, prepared and enacted into law a measure to conscript for active war service all able-bodied citizens, all capital, all labor, and all property, including money and factories. Then shall the American House of Representatives delay in the enactment of a measure for only a modest peacetime preparation? I earnestly plead with you that it shall not. [Applause.]

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Did the Committee on Military Affairs hold hearings on this bill?

Mr. MAY. Very extensive hearings.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Is the gentleman's committee unanimously satisfied that this authorization is all our country requires at this time to meet our national-defense needs in view of the international situation?

Mr. MAY. We think it is the minimum that should be authorized. There is possibly a great deal of feeling in the committee that it ought to be larger, but we thought it best to move steadily and cautiously, and it was all that the President had asked.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. And that decision comes about after very serious and well-considered hearings.

Mr. MAY. Yes. We held extensive hearings and discussed in executive session every angle of our country's needs.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. Was the concluding sentence of the gentleman's statement to the effect that negotiated contracts are authorized? Is the Department permitted now to negotiate contracts without the delay necessary in competitive bidding?

Mr. MAY. Within certain amounts, but very small amounts.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. Under the terms of this act?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. In other words, you are, by this legislation, going to make it possible to contract by negotiation and the contracts will be entered into by negotiation rather than by competitive bidding?

Mr. MAY. Not all of them. Where it interferes with the program they will go ahead with it without regard to competitive bidding. That is intended to be resorted to in great emergencies only.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include at the proper point certain tables in connection with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request of the gentleman will be granted, except that he must get permission to include the tables while in the House.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, at the outset I remind all the Members of the House that last year at the start of the first session of this Congress upon the appointment of the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], a Republican defense committee was set up under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and it is at the suggestion of the minority leader that I today refer to a portion at least of the two reports drafted by the chairman of the special Republican committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and submitted to the Congress. In the first session of the Congress that report read as follows:

In the foreign policy of the United States, which has been consistent and has developed naturally with the years, there has been for over a century but one principle which has remained definite and unchanged—the principle known as the Monroe Doctrine. The famous declaration of President Monroe informed the nations of Europe that the United States would regard any attempt to extend European domination in the countries of Central and South America as an unfriendly act. It is not a treaty, nor has any foreign power ever approved it. It is, in truth, a "no trespass" sign posted around the entire area south of the Rio Grande, and as the years have passed we have made it plain that the warning is addressed to all foreign powers, no matter where situated.

While the doctrine may be of advantage to the nations of Latin America, fundamentally it is our doctrine and ours alone. We adhere to it because we are convinced that our safety is dependent upon its enforcement. It is a policy of defense.

The United States may from time to time adopt new attitudes and pursue new policies relating to other matters in this ever-changing world, but there can be no lessening of its devotion to the Monroe Doctrine because this, more than any other single aspect of policy, involves the safety of the Nation and its vital interests.

Especially is this true now that, by an act of Congress, we are withdrawing from the Philippines and shall not be expected to defend those islands.

Obviously, our Military Establishment must be adequate to carry out the obligations so clearly implied in the Monroe Doctrine—the obligation to prevent the extension of foreign political domination through military action in the Western Hemisphere. This may well be considered as part of the supreme obligation to defend the continental United States. We thus envision our whole defense. Without the Panama Canal we should be sadly handicapped. It is our life line and must be maintained.

For our defense in the Pacific we believe the mission of our Military Establishment is the maintenance, impregnably, of the line following roughly the one hundred and eightieth meridian, commencing at the Alaskan Islands, passing somewhat westward of Hawaii, and thence generally southeastward to include and cover the Panama Canal. With comparatively slight additions our presently authorized military strength, both Army and Navy, is equal to that particular task.

We conceive the disposition of our military forces in the Atlantic and the Pacific as having a common objective—the enforcement of our defense policy. We should look upon Oahu as an outpost not only of our Pacific coast but of the Canal. We should look upon Guantanamo and Puerto Rico and our naval and aviation establishments along our Atlantic coast as likewise outposts of Panama. Everything should be done to extend and strengthen such outposts in the areas of defense, whether they be in the hands of the Army or the Navy.

As for Panama itself, there is great need of a substantial increase in the strength of the garrison in order that the armament now there or shortly to be installed may be manned with at least one shift; and we must add certain equipment vital to the conduct of its defense.

If we control the sea and the air over a wide radius from the Canal, it will not be easy for an enemy to reach it from the sea. Likewise, if when the need arises, we take instant measures to prevent the establishment of hostile bases in Central or South America, we shall have gone a long way toward closing the door.

With our defense system made effective far out in the Pacific and far out in the Atlantic, with hostile military infiltration promptly prevented, and with the Canal itself fortified to the utmost degree of effectiveness, we shall be secure in the Western World. Such should be our military policy; such must be our defense.

That statement was submitted to Congress, and subsequent actions of the Congress last year generally approved of it. At the same time this report was rendered we offered a supplemental report upon the question of manufacturing airplanes under contract, and if the Members will recall, we did not oppose the limit in number of airplanes requested, but we did recommend that the number of airplanes to be manufactured should be staggered in amounts over 2 or 3 years in order to minimize the possibility of obsolescence. I believe the War Department and the General Staff to some extent now agree with us, but I will agree that at that time we did not foresee the start of the war abroad and consequent developments in planes which has taken place.

Another report was submitted by that special defense committee early this year, and I shall place that entire report in the RECORD at this point:

Further study prompts the minority to submit to the House some considerations which it deems to be of the utmost importance at this time.

Our concern is heightened and intensified by what we see going on all over the world today. Recent events strengthen our determination that we shall remain at peace, and secure in that peace. As we plan for security we mean security not only in the physical or material sense but, taking the long view, the security of our free institutions.

Our thoughts now turn to the present condition of our military services. In order that they shall be able to perform the mission assigned to them, it is obvious that we need them in adequate strength. It is when we come to give consideration to the strength of the services—not only strength in numbers but especially strength in material and equipment of all kinds—that we find ourselves confronting a difficult and complicated circumstance. It is conceded, we believe, that both the Army and the Navy should be stronger if our military defense is to be adequate. We believe, further, that there would be little hesitation on the part of the Congress in adding very substantially to the present-day strength, especially in equipment, were it not for that circumstance which confronts us and which we must not ignore.

To reach a better understanding of it we must reexamine the broad outline of our participation in the World War. Upon doing so we are reminded that when we entered that war, in April of 1917, the national debt stood at \$1,100,000,000. In the 18 months

of our participation we spent something in excess of \$35,000,000,000. To meet that expenditure we raised about ten billions through taxes. We borrowed the remainder, and came out of the World War with a national debt of twenty-six billions. That war-time financing was accomplished with comparative ease, for when we began it the Government owed very little.

Compare that to our present situation. For 8 or 9 years the Federal Treasury has been running in the red. Through all of these years we have been spending much more than we have collected from taxes. The more we have spent the more we have borrowed. As a result, we have piled up a huge national debt. Present law provides that the national debt shall not exceed \$45,000,000,000. It is now conceded that by the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1940, the direct bonded debt will have approached \$44,000,000,000. If our spending in the near future goes on at anything like the recent rate, the \$45,000,000,000 limit will be reached, the Congress will have to raise the limit, and we shall continue plunging along the reckless road.

Let us remember, therefore, that should we be drawn into a war of first magnitude, we should have to start with a debt of at least \$44,000,000,000, probably more, and then finance the effort on top of that debt. It is a prospect which must concern every thoughtful person in the land.

The President himself gave evidence of his concern when in his message to the Congress he suggested the imposition of a special tax calculated to produce revenue sufficient to meet the additional burden of the national defense and, at the same time, avoid the necessity of increasing the debt limit. While we share the President's apparent concern, we are convinced that the imposition of an additional special national-defense tax would be inadequate as a remedy and essentially unsound. It would not reach the heart of the problem.

No one at this time can foresee accurately the measures we might have to employ were we drawn into war, but all of us can visualize the danger to our institutions were we forced to resort to inflation, to confiscation, and ultimate repudiation. Could our free institutions survive such a strain? Similar institutions have perished in other lands within our time. Driven to such expedients it might well be that we shall have failed actually in our defense.

Such a possibility should convince us that the most serious weakness in the armor of our national defense today is the existence of a national debt of \$44,000,000,000. There it stands, towering, ominous. Much as we should like to, we cannot consider our problem solely in terms of soldiers and sailors, of divisions and battleships.

To deny that a healthy economic condition is vital to our national defense would be absurd. Our ability to mobilize and maintain the resources of the country in a major effort depends fundamentally upon the strength of our national economy. True, we need soldiers and sailors, divisions and battleships, with adequate modern equipment, but to secure their effectiveness in a long, grueling struggle, and at the same time to preserve our institutions, we must mend our ways.

It will not be an easy task. We have acquired a habit difficult to cast off. Many of our people, thoughtless of the consequences, laugh at debt and demand that spending shall go on. But it must be curbed, for we cannot go on this way and be secure in this troubled world.

The maintenance of our defense is linked with the maintenance of all other necessary activities of our Government. At the present juncture we cannot separate one from the other. The cost of the whole of them combined must be our concern as we strive to put our house in order.

To put it simply, our plea is that the Congress, and others in high authority, reestablish thrift as a virtue in the conduct of government, as it is a virtue in the conduct of the individual.

For myself, on the tax question, I remind members of the committee that the President recently vetoed the river and harbor appropriation bill, carrying an authorization for expenditure of upward of \$100,000,000. I wonder what he is going to do with the agricultural appropriation bill, which includes an expense in excess of what he recommended of over \$200,000,000 for farm parity. It seems to me that if he is to be consistent, having vetoed the river and harbor bill, he will also veto the agricultural appropriation bill with the excessive amounts in it for parity, which brings me to my point. I believe that we should have taxes to pay for any overage above the debt limit, but that tax should not of necessity be called a national-defense tax, because the overage would be only partially due to the expense of national defense. Such a tax should be termed what it actually would be, a "deficit tax."

A great deal has been heard about pouring money down the rat hole. I want to give you a brief résumé—and I am going to insert it in the RECORD at this point—an analysis of the War Department appropriation bills for the fiscal years from 1930 to 1940. It will show the entire picture.

Analysis of War Department appropriations, fiscal years 1930-40, inclusive

(1) Fiscal year	(2) Pay, military personnel		(3) Pay, civilian personnel		(4) Clothing		(5) Subsistence and forage		(6) Training, direct charges		(7) New equipment and ammunition, augmentation and replacement and modernization	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1930	\$156,927,000	47.2	\$18,950,000	5.7	\$7,387,000	2.2	\$33,670,000	10.2	\$6,501,000	2.0	\$28,196,000	8.5
1931	154,987,000	44.7	19,034,000	5.5	8,059,000	2.3	32,255,000	9.3	7,712,000	2.2	32,078,000	9.2
1932	154,864,000	46.2	20,543,000	6.13	7,544,000	2.25	28,518,000	8.5	3,462,000	1.03	30,366,000	9.6
1933	153,334,000	50.4	14,809,000	4.9	6,384,000	2.1	24,417,000	7.5	9,833,000	3.2	18,780,000	6.2
1934	143,893,000	51.9	15,488,000	5.6	4,188,000	1.5	19,273,000	6.95	7,780,000	2.8	8,903,000	3.2
1935	166,389,000	59.2	14,718,000	5.2	3,082,000	1.1	20,732,000	7.4	6,407,000	2.3	21,406,000	7.6
1936	166,349,000	56.9	13,926,000	3.9	5,894,000	1.7	25,917,000	7.3	11,383,000	3.2	54,178,000	15.3
1937	180,856,000	46.6	21,481,000	5.5	7,702,000	2.0	34,502,000	8.9	9,663,000	2.5	63,215,000	16.3
1938	188,132,000	45.11	22,454,000	5.4	12,911,000	3.1	36,889,000	8.8	11,140,000	2.7	58,917,000	14.1
1939	195,303,000	42.5	23,280,000	5.1	14,925,000	3.2	35,442,000	7.7	12,227,000	2.7	84,559,000	18.4
1940	231,870,000	25.1	29,049,000	3.1	24,915,000	2.7	41,908,000	4.5	41,385,000	4.5	302,429,000	32.8
Total	1,892,904,000		213,762,000		102,961,000		335,533,000		127,393,000		703,027,000	

(1) Fiscal year	(8) Maintenance of armament, ammunition, and equipment, including repairs		(9) New construction		(10) Housekeeping, rehabilitation, maintenance, and operation of plant and plant equipment		(11) Seacoast defense less new seacoast defense equipment		(12) Research and development		(13) Procurement planning		(14) Miscellaneous, including departmental, refunds, and unobligated balances		(15) 10-year totals
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
1930	\$4,327,000	1.3	\$15,154,000	4.4	\$45,031,000	13.5	\$1,489,000	0.4	\$4,263,000	1.3	\$35,000	0.001	\$10,038,000	3.02	\$331,998,000
1931	4,437,000	1.3	17,920,000	5.2	45,781,000	13.2	1,076,000	.21	4,494,000	1.3	102,000	.03	19,065,000	5.5	347,000,000
1932	9,983,000	2.98	21,270,000	6.35	42,206,000	12.6	1,590,000	.47	2,731,000	.8	177,000	.05	11,747,000	3.5	335,001,000
1933	9,668,000	3.2	2,535,000	.83	33,755,000	11.1	1,422,000	.47	5,187,000	1.7	500,000	.16	23,376,000	7.7	304,000,000
1934	3,037,000	1.1	104,000	.04	23,516,000	8.4	1,621,000	.59	3,404,000	1.2	135,000	.05	145,688,000	16.5	277,000,000
1935	4,022,000	1.4	139,000	.05	24,606,000	8.8	752,000	.26	5,203,000	1.8	158,000	.05	13,386,000	4.76	281,000,000
1936	11,584,000	3.3	10,474,000	3.0	28,973,000	8.2	650,000	.18	6,809,000	1.9	674,000	.19	18,189,000	5.1	355,000,000
1937	20,554,000	5.3	2,969,000	.76	15,338,000	3.95	7,299,000	1.9	5,270,000	1.4	158,000	.04	19,095,000	4.9	388,002,000
1938	20,620,000	4.9	10,451,000	2.5	20,044,000	4.8	3,613,000	.86	6,201,000	1.5	182,000	.04	25,446,000	6.1	417,000,000
1939	25,259,000	5.5	10,271,000	2.3	25,582,000	5.6	5,509,000	1.2	5,463,000	1.2	332,000	.07	21,298,000	4.63	460,000,000
1940	33,259,000	3.6	25,380,000	2.7	50,458,000	5.5	4,564,000	.5	11,430,000	1.2	1,246,000	.13	125,107,000	13.55	923,000,000
Total	146,850,000		17,117,000		355,290,000		29,585,000		60,455,000		3,699,000		332,435,000		4,419,001,000

¹ Including refunds under Economy Act.

NOTE.—To reconcile this chart for fiscal year 1937-40, inclusive, with chart (table A), Finance Branch, G-4, May 16, 1940, it should be noted: (a) That "seacoast defenses" has been separated from "Maintenance and operation of plant and plant equipment." (b) That "Departmental" has been consolidated with Miscellaneous, refunds and unobligated balances." (c) That percentages have been reworked on a basis of the total appropriation, rather than on the basis of expenditures."

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman please give us the high spots? We have no report and we have to vote before we will get a chance to read the RECORD.

Mr. ANDREWS. A great deal has been written by columnists and a great deal is appearing in the newspapers—not supported by the facts—today on this subject. Regardless of any figures used in this connection, the total figure of all appropriations for the benefit of the War Department—Army-military—in the last 10 fiscal years, 1930-40, inclusive, as applying to the Army is \$4,419,000,000. This does not include the figure for the current 1941 appropriation bill for the War Department.

It is revealing to find, when we think of the lack of equipment, the lack of modernization or mechanization, that of the total figure of \$4,500,000,000 the total pay for the military personnel, all War Department bills for 10 years is almost \$2,000,000,000. The other very large item is that of new equipment, ammunition, replacement, and modernization. To show you how that has jumped up only in the last year or two, I will read the figures:

Roughly, for 1930 it was \$28,000,000; 1931, \$32,000,000; 1932, \$30,000,000; 1933, \$18,000,000; 1934, \$8,000,000; 1939 it jumped to \$84,000,000. For last year it is \$302,000,000.

The two largest items for the 10 years—that is, from 1930 to 1940—not including this year's appropriation bill, are pay for military personnel, approximately \$2,000,000,000; new equipment, ammunition, replacement, and modernization, \$700,000,000.

The next largest item is that for rehabilitation, operations of plant, \$355,000,000.

I am going to place that table in the RECORD, because I think it will show the way that things have been stepped up in the last 2 years.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. IZAC. Will the gentleman state whether the total he gave includes the civil functions of the War Department, or only for military expenditure?

Mr. ANDREWS. Only for military purposes. Now I want to outline to you the figures on the strength of the Regular Army and the National Guard today. This will include the addition of 15,000 enlisted men of the Regular Army, which will be provided for in the new appropriation. No authorization for this increase is required in this bill, because the peacetime authorization for enlisted strength of the Army is now set at 280,000 men. With the addition of the 15,000 men in the program the enlisted strength of the Regular Army will be 242,000. The National Guard at its present figure, 235,000.

Of the Regular Army today the figure given you, in overseas garrisons, including Air Corps, 70,000. At home, of the Regular Army, 27,000 in the air force; 5,000 on harbor-defense work; 36,000 in the zone of the interior, including schools, depots, hospitals, and so forth; 104,000 either actively in or attached to the mobile combat ground forces. That last figure would break down into six streamlined infantry divisions totaling approximately 50,000. That would be mobile shock troops, the new streamlined divisions being trained in the South this last winter.

The figure for the National Guard, of course, is largely represented in the figure 215,500 mobile combat ground forces.

A Regular Army of 242,000 permits the organization of 6 infantry divisions at peacetime strength; 1 cavalry division; 1 mechanized brigade; and the supporting Army corps troops necessary to weld these divisions into effective modern combat teams, as well as nondivisional organizations which will form the nuclei of new divisions in event of future expansion.

A National Guard of 235,000 permits the organization of 18 infantry divisions at approximately 70 percent peace strength, and certain supporting troops.

Under the P. M. P.—a term for “protective mobilization plan”—in other words, P. M. P. is protective mobilization plan, and included in that would be what is referred to as protective mobilized force.

Should the P. M. P.—and that is what this whole program refers to—be put into effect, the Regular Army and National Guard would merge into the Army of the United States with the troops assigned approximately as follows: In overseas garrisons including Air Corps, 115,000; at home, in the air force, 31,000; harbor defenses, 51,600.

You will note today that on harbor defense we have only 5,000 in the Regular Army and 11,000 National Guard.

Zone of interior, including schools, hospitals, and so forth, 102,000; mobile combat ground forces, in streamlined divisions, 690,000; individual replacements, 150,000; making the complete force, with the replacements, approximately 1,100,000 men.

The foregoing provides for 27 divisions, 9 of the Regular Army, 5 at war strength, 4 at peacetime strength; 18 from the National Guard at peacetime strength; and 6 cavalry divisions, 1 at war strength and 5 at existing strength; 3 tank regiments, 1 mechanized brigade, and the supporting corps and Army troops to balance the force so that it might operate as two armies.

The program of which we hear so much is a program of modernization and mechanization, in addition to increases in the Air Corps and planes, taking advantage of the most recent information the General Staff has been able to absorb from the present war abroad, for the benefit of our present Regular Army and National Guard. It would also complete almost all of the mechanized equipment, supplies, and munitions which would be required for the P. M. P. force were we ever obliged to call it into being. The reason for it is obvious. It takes time to provide munitions; it will have to have storage; it takes time to provide the new modern anti-aircraft guns and new modern airplanes.

Summarizing that program briefly, I can break it down:

The first item is for anti-aircraft equipment and munitions, \$64,000,000.

The modernization of combat planes, \$28,000,000. We are going to have to put up \$28,000,000 now for modernizing planes we bought last year.

Training and equipment for 7,000 pilots and for the construction of 200 B-17—that is the large 4-motor bombers—\$186,000,000. Eighty million dollars of that is for 200 B-17 bombers. So you can get an idea how much they cost.

For speeding production of war munitions and the general speed-up, \$32,000,000.

Essential items, commercial items, \$64,000,000.

The enlistment and training of 15,000 additional men of the Regular Army and their maintenance, \$29,000,000.

General mechanization and equipment for the ground forces—that is the big lot of it—\$264,000,000.

Production and procurement of powder, storage of powder, ammunition, and assistance to plants, \$44,000,000.

For additions to our seacoast defenses, \$4,000,000.

For the air base at Alaska, \$8,000,000.

For general overhead planning of expansion under the War Department, \$7,000,000.

This makes an approximate total of \$732,000,000.

I want now to pass briefly to a discussion of the bill.

I may say to the Members present that authorization for a considerable proportion of the total amount to be appropriated is unnecessary from the standpoint of any new authorizations. The bill includes only such new authorizations

as are requisite and in some instances suspensions of existing law.

The purpose of this bill is to insure, insofar as possible, that the strengthening of the national defense shall be expedited. It contains certain authorizations and removes certain limitations now prescribed by law. It is especially important to note and remember that there is no permanent change in existing law authorized by the bill. It does suspend the operation during the fiscal year 1941 of several provisions of law which must be suspended if the defense program, particularly that part connected with essential increases in the number of airplanes and of pilots and of flying cadets to be trained as pilots is to be accomplished. This is the proviso on page 3, line 2. For example, under existing law the number of flying cadets authorized is 2,500. The bill reported out by the committee raises that to an average of 8,500 during the fiscal year 1941. In order to train such a number of flying cadets as pilots it is necessary that there be an increase in the number of airplanes and an increase in the number of Air Corps Reserve officers on active duty with the Regular Army. The bill therefore suspends the present limitation of 3,000 Air Corps Reserve second lieutenants and temporarily increases the number to 6,000, irrespective of grade. As a natural result, the existing limitation of 6,000 on the number of aircraft is suspended during the fiscal year 1941, because if we remain within that number we will have to sacrifice a great percentage of our combat planes in order to provide training planes. That is the authorization on page 2, line 10. Other statutory provisions, particularly those contained in several sections of the National Defense Act, prescribe the commissioned and enlisted strength of the various branches of the Army. With the exception of the strength of the Air Corps, these strengths were fixed 20 years ago at the time the National Defense Act was comprehensively amended.

It is obvious that the proportions between the various branches which were fixed in 1920 have no relation to present requirements of organization. Developments of the last several years in connection with equipment and weapons have made it necessary to change the organization of the combat units of the Army. Many of these changes have been effected in the past coincident with the development of matériel. It was not necessary, however, to seek changes in the authorized strength of the various branches because until 4 years ago the Army was held to a strength of less than 120,000, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts, and no difficulty arose as a practical matter, but now that the Army is approaching its maximum peacetime strength of 280,000 men it is impossible to assign officers and men to the various branches in the numbers needed and still comply with the provisions of law.

Another major item in the bill is the authorization for the construction of plants and buildings for the manufacture, maintenance, and storage of military equipment, munitions, and supplies, and the acquisition of such land as may be needed in connection therewith. This refers to the first proviso at the bottom of page 1. There is no present or prospective commercial capacity in this country for the production of powder and high explosives and for plants to afford facilities for the loading of ammunition in any such amounts as would be needed in the event of an emergency. Private industry cannot afford such facilities, as they are only needed in critical periods of our history and are not susceptible of general commercial use after the major function has been accomplished. The Government must provide such facilities so that they may be available. An army without munitions is not an army. The main body of the bill with the first proviso makes such construction possible and in doing so, partly by implication and partly by special provision, suspends until the end of the fiscal year 1942 the provisions of Revised Statutes 1136, which prohibits the construction of permanent buildings and structures unless detailed estimates shall have been previously submitted to Congress and approved by a special appropriation, and also prohibits the erection of buildings or structures of a permanent nature, the cost of which exceeds \$20,000, unless by special authority of Congress.

Coming back to the question of civil service, I may say that the fourth proviso on page 2, line 14, has been the subject of some discussion in the committee. I understand now that general agreement has been reached by the War Department with the Civil Service Commission and that a member of the majority will offer an amendment returning the War Department to the full provisions of the Civil Service Act for the selection of employees under this act. The last proviso having to do with the civil service is No. 5 at the bottom of page 2. This relates to minor administrative matters.

There is a proviso which authorizes the waiver of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, which is published as section 652 of title 5 of the United States Code. That section of the 1912 act provides the procedure for discharging civil-service employees of the Government. Both the War and Navy Departments feel that a suspension of these provisions, under the authority of the heads of the departments concerned, is necessary during the coming year in order to enable cases of sabotage or spying to be promptly and effectively dealt with. I am informed that the Civil Service Commission agrees that such suspension should be authorized. The suspension will undoubtedly also have a strong effect in making employees realize that they must be careful in considering apparently innocent suggestions which may be made to them by persons not authorized to deal with the work upon which they are engaged.

Coming to section 2, the emergency powers of the President, I have no doubt there will be several amendments offered in regard to this fund and the question of an advisory board should be considered. I may say that insofar as the provisions of the House bill are concerned they are substantially similar to provisions in the Senate bill except that the figures \$132,000,000 on page 4 include the authorization for the \$66,000,000 appropriation and an additional \$66,000,000 for which only authorization is requested.

The last five lines on page 4 represent an amendment which was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Military Affairs. If you will look at the provisions of the Senate bill in this respect you will find that opening language is practically the same, but the Senate provisions would not require a report from the President until June 30, 1942. I believe I express the opinion of the Committee on Military Affairs, certainly of the minority members thereof, when I say that we feel that at a critical time like this, with the large figures to be placed at the disposal of one man, we should receive a report at the beginning of any subsequent session, whether it be special or regular. In other words, if we were to adjourn in June and there should be a special session in November, it would become mandatory for the President to give us a detailed account of all expenditures made or authorized under this section.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that if the present Chief of Staff were here in my place and someone asked him what he regarded as important considerations to bear in mind, not only in time of relative stress like this but at any time, in his position as Chief of Staff he would stress, I feel sure, that the Chief of Staff and the General Staff should discount two things, hysteria and political considerations in one direction or the other.

We are a nation of extremists, and hysteria runs two ways. Either way hysteria runs, political consideration runs with it. Hysteria and political consideration exist with the Executive, no matter who he may be. He is influenced thereby. The Congress is a victim in the same way. We represent the people, at least we hope we do, and as hysteria goes one way with the people it has its effect on the Congress.

It is all important that the General Staff and Chief of Staff discount hysteria and discount politics in the executive or the legislative branch, and above everything else to be factual and realistic, no matter how the wind may blow. At the present time, to my mind, we have in the Chief of Staff from the standpoint of ability the best trained man who has ever held that position, and certainly from the standpoint of understanding what it is to have a modernized, mechanized, small army of effectiveness. He is an

industrious man. A tremendous amount has been accomplished in mechanizing and modernizing this army during the last year under his leadership and a considerable amount was accomplished during the closing years of the tour of General Craig. You may not realize it, but the Regular Army as such today is in the process of complete reorganization in shifting over into smaller streamlined divisions. Its make-up and tactics are being changed. I do not believe there has been a time in the last year when the Chief of Staff has not known what he wanted so far as a larger force is concerned and particularly increased needs in equipment if there had been any disposition on the part of the Congress to give it to him. In conclusion, we might best follow the opinions and the recommendations of the professional soldier trained for the job. So I close with confidence and faith in the ability, energy, patience, and soundness of the Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman has been so helpful relative to section 2. May I say that the present occupant of the White House is the only President I have and I am glad to give him this power. But I want to ask the gentleman a question. Our correspondence all has this tone in it: What have you been doing with this money? This is hardly the time to bring that up, but the gentleman gave us the figures. He omitted to criticize or approve. I want to put in the communications to my constituents the gentleman's words, because that question must be answered. It is ill-timed, but necessary. All of our correspondence contains that query. What does the gentleman say about that?

Mr. ANDREWS. It is only within the last 2 or 3 years that the Regular Army has received anything constructive in the way of appropriations for what we know as modernization. Possibly it would have been different if we knew in 1936 what we know now.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman has no criticism?

Mr. ANDREWS. I am talking about the bill today.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman has no criticism of the past? He said nothing.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire at the outset of my remarks to pay my respect to our able and efficient Secretary of War, the Honorable Harry Woodring. As a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs I wish to say that we have at all times found him to be a genuine, patriotic American gentleman of the very highest type and at all times keenly alive to the problems of the Army. He has always been able to secure the very highest cooperation from our committee. I am sure this Nation has never had a Secretary of War who has been better qualified for the position. [Applause.]

I am sure the same can be said of the very able and efficient Assistant Secretary of War, the Honorable Louis Johnson. [Applause.]

I also desire to join the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] in praise of the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, General Marshall, and, in addition, the members of his staff. [Applause.]

If today, in the face of this crisis in the history of the world, when civilization and democracy are threatened with extinction in the maelstrom of totalitarianism, we find our defenses woefully inadequate, I ask you in all candor, Who is to blame?

We, the Congress, are to blame. We are charged under the Constitution with the national defense. We have neglected it, and why? Because the Congress has been under the insidious control of pressure groups, some of which have been indifferent to matters of national defense because they desire legislation and appropriations to their own selfish ends. There are also other controlling influences which are

antagonistic to national defense because they hope to seize control of our Government, and our Army and Navy would be in the way of such a movement.

The general public is also to blame. It has fallen under the spell of the peace-at-any-price advocate and has been lulled into a false sense of security by the impractical pacifistic program which followed the World War. This movement kept us from joining the League of Nations, sank our Navy, brought about the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and kept our armed forces in the dog house on starvation rations. The sometimes misguided individuals, who were too often misguided by subversive influences, were not only willing, but eager, to trust the security of this Nation to such intangible factors as hopes, treaties, and pacts of nonaggression. They had solved the problem of war, which has been a curse upon mankind for centuries. After all, the solution was very simple. They were going to stay out of war by just refusing to fight. After all, it takes two to make a fight. It was all so easy. The millennium had arrived. "Peace. It is wonderful," said Father Divine. "Amen," echoed Stalin and Hitler with self-satisfied, sardonic smiles. The wily Japanese chuckled with glee. [Applause.]

There was also a wealth of pro-German propaganda, which was disguised as anti-British propaganda. Oh, yes; the Germans have perfected all branches of their war machine since the World War, and this propaganda arm is one of their major services. All kinds of anti-British stories were circulated, even to branding England as the aggressor. Many otherwise sound-minded individuals believed even this. Then the matter of French and British war debts was kept in the foreground, while the German debts were kept in the shadow. This pro-German propaganda went hand in hand with the activities of communism and attached itself, as a barnacle, to every other vehicle possible. It was being used to prevent us from arming.

Anyone who dared to raise his voice for armament was classed as an alarmist, a jingoist, and a warmonger. Whenever preparedness was advocated, impractical voices arose asking, "Whom are you going to fight?" The Fables of the Munitions Industry became one of the most popular books of the day, and created a lucrative demand for the services of its author on the lecture platform. At infrequent intervals America's "flying sounding board" sounded off over the radio, whenever the spirit moved his prompters. Every time either the Army or the Navy stuck their head out of the dog house they received a sharp wallop from the rolling pin of some lusty crusader or were poked in the eye with the umbrella of some long-faced, blue-nosed reformer. [Applause.]

Of course, we were not going to have a war to enrich the merchants of death. We would just not go to a war. Well, neither did Norway, Holland, or Belgium go to war. But war came to them—which was far worse. They depended upon pacts, nonaggression treaties, and hopes; but the iron heel of Mars descended just the same. Now they lie crushed, raped, and destroyed—helpless in the merciless grasp of the conqueror. If they had joined the Allies 10 months ago to invade their common enemy and had carried the war, with all of its death, destruction, and horror, into Germany, where it belongs, they probably could have won. Instead they remained out of the war in hope that war would not come to them. As a result of this attitude they have been defeated in detail. Now, regardless of whether or not France and Great Britain win, these small, would-be neutrals have lost. They can never win in this war, even though their territory be restored to them. They failed to heed the fundamental principle of either warfare or defense—offensive.

Mr. Chairman, here I want to repeat a statement I have often made to this House. Wars cannot be won by passive defense. Read your histories. No major conflict was ever won, except on the ground of the enemy. Today, with the advent of modern mechanical progress, this is more true than ever. The airplane has become one of the principal weapons of destruction. Its use is particularly deadly to the industrial army. If this army is destroyed or defeated, the forces in the theater of operations must capitulate. The

airplane operates in a field of three dimensions. It can elude the aircraft seeking it. It can come over a great height, cut off its engines when many miles from its target, glide down without a sound, discharge its bombs and be gone before pursuit can organize or ground fire can destroy it. The first intimation of its deadly presence is too often the destructive crash of its bombs.

The only defense against this deadly weapon today is to invade the nation which is using it, destroy it on the ground, along with the base from which it is operating and the facilities which are servicing it. Unless this is done it can continue its destructive missions indefinitely. Its destruction will require offensive action. Unless we are prepared to undertake missions of this character, we might just as well make up our minds to become a second-class nation, scrap the Monroe Doctrine, and submit to whatever insult or indignity any armed nation wishes to offer. There can be no half-way measures. "If we make ourselves sheep, the wolves will eat us."

Now, I have been asked if the consummation of this program will place us in the position where we will be able to cope with a modern army. No, indeed; it will not. If we acquire the capacity to produce planes for an air force equal to that of any major power, we are still short of tanks, combat cars, and artillery. Unless we have these components, we will have an unbalanced army. The air corps cannot take and hold ground, unless it be by cooperation with the "fifth column." To send infantry into battle today, unsupported by mechanized forces, would be a useless slaughter. It would be equivalent to "sending men raw into battle as they were picked raw from the street." If we permit conditions to become so that this will be necessary, we will be guilty of being accessories to mass murder.

To bring our Army up to the standard it should be brought to would require the addition of 10 mechanized divisions, with all the necessary auxiliary and service troops. That would require a minimum expenditure of between one and one-half and two billion dollars. It would also require time. I am sure the program now before us will assist in solving the time factor by increasing our production capacity. If I am a Member of the next Congress, I shall demand that our armed forces be increased to the size necessary to properly provide for our security. It will be expensive; but not to do so may very well be disastrous.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word about the criticisms which have lately been hurled at the Army to the effect that for all the money we have spent, we do not have a modern, highly mobile Army equipped with the most modern weapons. A great deal of this criticism comes from the same people who a short time ago were demanding "whom are you going to fight?"

There is no doubt but that the United States Army is expensive, and rearming it is an exceedingly expensive matter. Our Army is expensive, because it is a voluntary Army conducted as our people desire it to be conducted. The War Department, which is charged with the responsibility of maintaining and increasing its efficiency, necessarily has to accept many conditions which cause it to be an expensive Army.

One reason for the large expense is that we take care of our soldiers, make sure they are well quartered, that they have excellent medical and dental attention, that they have reasonable recreational facilities, that their food is good, and that their clothing is comfortable and practical. [Applause.] The average pay of an enlisted man in one of the foreign armies is 65 cents a month. In our Army it is \$39 a month, yet Army pay is below the standard of Navy pay. Over 65 percent of the expenditures for 1937, 1938, and 1939 went for pay, rations, and similar items, including the maintenance of a hundred and more scattered posts. Even in 1940, when the Budget figure is much greater, due to appropriations for equipment, this percentage is over 45 percent.

More than two-thirds of the money that we have appropriated for our armed forces went for pay, food, clothing, quarters, recreational facilities, and items of that kind that

directly go to make up the morale and contribute to the well-being of the men in the Army. I feel sure that the American public desires that their Army be kept in a standard that corresponds to the standard in the homes from which the soldiers come, homes which know the highest standard of living of those of any nation in the world. [Applause.]

In the Army we do not have our troops combined at a few large posts where such costs as maintenance would be on the most economical basis. Instead, we have posts scattered throughout the entire country. Most of them are very small ones. When we hold maneuvers of large bodies of troops, it means added expense to assemble them and their equipment. This disbursement also means additional expenses for fixed charges. I am not referring to new construction required in many posts during past years.

A large portion of our Army is stationed in foreign garrisons. By their very nature, these garrisons must be given the very best of modern defensive equipment, including seacoast fortifications. Just to place these defenses in order there was appropriated \$8,500,000 in 1937, \$5,000,000 in 1938, \$6,500,000 in 1939, \$14,000,000 in 1940, a total of \$34,000,000.

Under our military system we depend to a large extent upon the civilian components. They are part of our military system and obviate the necessity of a large standing army. To the National Guard in 1937 went \$38,000,000, in 1938 \$41,000,000, in 1939 \$43,000,000, in 1940 \$71,500,000, a total of \$193,500,000. Much of this money, of course, goes to local communities.

Mr. Chairman, this money is money which is distributed throughout the entire United States. It goes into the various local communities, and a great deal of it goes to the butcher, the baker, the grocery man, the landlord, and other people who depend upon it for an income. It is distributed with just as much benefit to the Nation as is the money which goes for relief.

For the maintenance of our military schools, so vitally necessary because we lack the great war college of organized army corps and armies available to nations with large standing armies, there was appropriated during those same 4 years almost \$43,000,000, of which \$29,000,000 was for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and citizens' military training camps. Much of this money is also spent all over the Nation.

When all these charges are taken away, we then come down to charges which have a direct bearing upon maintenance and the securing of new equipment. In 1937 our military expenditures were approximately \$380,000,000. Out of that we had \$20,000,000 for the maintenance of equipment and ammunition. This did not build up anything. It merely took care of our needs for that year to replace that used in target practice. For replacing worn-out equipment and modernizing or bringing up to date some of our older equipment we had \$52,000,000 available, but for securing new equipment we had only \$10,000,000. In 1938, out of a total expenditure of \$402,000,000, we had again \$20,000,000 for maintenance of equipment and ammunition, \$59,000,000 for replacement and modernization, but only a little less than \$7,000,000 for securing new equipment.

In 1939 our obligations totaled \$455,000,000, of which we had \$25,000,000 for maintenance, almost \$62,000,000 for replacement and modernization, but the figure for augmentation was increased to almost \$23,000,000, which was 5 percent of the total. In 1940 our appropriation was drastically increased, permitting us to obligate \$33,000,000 for maintenance of equipment and ammunition, to utilize \$81,000,000 for replacement and modernization, and to employ \$221,000,000 for augmentation. These figures included a triple expansion of the Air Corps.

The funds recently made available to the War Department are now being translated into actual equipment. Deliveries have not been completed, but, as has been stated many times, we cannot buy airplanes and ordnance matériel off the shelf. It takes from 1 to 2 years to secure deliveries after the money is appropriated. The equipment is necessarily expensive because we comply with wage-hour requirements and pay full prices for labor and materials.

These funds provide a great many of the critical items of armament and equipment required by the initial protective

force. However, even if the 1941 Budget proposal for equipment is accepted, there will remain to be provided \$39,000,000 of critical equipment for the existing forces and about \$70,000,000 for seacoast defense, and an additional \$240,000,000 of equipment for the protective mobilization plan. There is one other point I should explain. As you know, we have a Regular Army of 227,000, and of that Army practically 70,000 are now engaged in Army maneuvers. It has apparently not been understood why the mobile Army is not of a larger size. As I have pointed out, the Army is necessarily scattered. This requires a rather high percentage of overhead. In addition, we have our foreign garrisons, our extensive school set-up, Air Corps, and Coast Artillery. There are practically 67,000 men in our overseas commands; about 44,000 in the air force; 37,000 in the zone of interior, including War Department, corps areas, 154 camps and posts, 35 arsenals and depots, 26 schools, and 5 general hospitals; and our harbor defenses are of about 4,000—so that the actual mobile field Army in the continental United States is, as you can see, only around 75,000 troops. Heretofore it has always been composed of what might be called the residue of the estate—what is left over after the other irreducibles had been provided for. It remained scattered in isolated Army posts, training the components, to be sure, but not given a chance to train itself as a cohesive force. It has now been given that opportunity, and, as a result, can now be considered as well trained, reasonably well equipped, and, though small, ready for action. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, President Roosevelt has been in power ever since Hitler came into power in Germany. No man in America has had a better opportunity to observe the preparedness program in Germany during the last 7 years. President Roosevelt has had full advantage of the information that came through his military and naval aides at Berlin, but, nevertheless, knowing that Germany had modernized its army, the President of the United States has completely failed to take cognizance of these facts and of this information and has failed to modernize and properly equip the Army of the United States; and I say this without fear of contradiction from anyone.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Perhaps the President listened to the voice of his own Congressman, the gentleman who is now speaking, who assured us last fall there would be no war. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. I think, if the President of the United States would follow the advice and the voice of his Congressman, the country would know that the United States of America would never be mixed up in any foreign wars. [Applause.] However, President Roosevelt—and I may regret the fact, but I have to admit it—is the Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States. The President as Commander in Chief is responsible for our national defense and not the Congressman from his district.

I believe in adequate national defense, and have at all times, but I think it is not unfair to say that the President has failed to modernize our Army. This is just one more failure along with his failures with agriculture, industry, business, and to revive prosperity in America. His failure in national defense can be added right on to all the rest. It is nothing unusual even after the expenditure of \$7,000,000,000. What has happened to the people's money? Some of it apparently has gone down the proverbial rat hole. The difference between that great and courageous President, Theodore Roosevelt, who used to say "Speak softly, but carry a big stick," and the present President is that Franklin Delano Roosevelt speaks often, internationally, and threateningly, but has carried only a twig or a splinter. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How about the 12 years previous to the present administration? What did the administrations then do for national defense, especially the battleships?

Mr. FISH. Under those administrations we had a navy second to none all that time, a navy very much larger, of course, than the German Navy, which began to build only in recent years, since Hitler came into power. Also, it is only in recent years that Germany has begun to build an army.

Mr. KELLER rose.

Mr. FISH. I regret that in 8 minutes I do not have time to answer further questions. I should like to take you all on individually and collectively.

I have a high regard for my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Colonel FADDIS, but every time the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Colonel FADDIS, speaks he wipes out the Atlantic Ocean and compares America with Belgium, Holland, and Denmark, neighbors of Germany. I also go along with him in my personal praise of the Secretary of War, Mr. Woodring, because I like him and I think he is a fine man. But let us look at the record and let us see what Mr. Woodring had to say only a year ago about the efficiency of our Army in addressing the D. A. R. convention here in Washington:

I need not say to any audience such as the Daughters of the American Revolution that there has been a military, but not a militaristic, renaissance in the United States since 1933. Under the inspired leadership of our far-seeing Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt, there has been reborn an Army that constitutes a potent and effective element in our national defense.

[Applause.]

I will give you some more reason to applaud—

An Army that enjoys the support, the confidence, and approbation of millions of Americans whose honor, whose homes, whose freedom it defends.

And now what do we find? We find, according to this bill, we have practically no Army; that the President has completely failed to protect the interests of the United States; he has failed to modernize the Army, to give it the modern equipment which you demand in this bill, and to bring our Army up to European standards so it can fight any invader or any "blitzkrieg." Even our Chief of Staff says that our Army today could not mobilize 75,000 men to fight any invader that attacks our country, and that it is lacking in the new weapons of warfare.

I am only applying my criticism to the President, for his failure to arm the small Army of ours and to equip it and give it a chance to successfully fulfill its functions to defend our shores.

What I say does not apply, however, to the Navy. I believe we have the greatest and best navy in the world today [applause], and I am opposed to all this hysteria that goes around the country that we are going to be attacked by the German Navy when we have a navy seven times as big as the German Navy. What we want to do today is to equip properly and adequately our own Army with all modern weapons for national defense and the defense of our country, but not to send it abroad to fight other people's battles. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree that we need to do some extensive work in bringing ourselves to an adequate national defense, but I have believed that all along, and I feel I have been consistent in my belief. While the gentleman from New York was speaking I was reading an address that he made over the radio on January 19, 1939. It is very difficult for me to reconcile the statements that he has just made with some of the statements that he made in that address just after the President had asked us to expand the air defenses of the United States.

In the few minutes I have I want to read just a very few statements he made at that time:

What I intend to say this evening may not be approved or appreciated by New Deal war mongers, hysterical internationalists,

war profiteers, superpatriots, and Communists, who are all hell-bent on arming the United States to the teeth for the purpose of acting as a policeman for the entire world.

Mr. KELLER. Who was that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. [Laughter and applause.]

The contention that this country of ours is in danger of foreign attack is sheer political "bunk." It aims to deceive the people into supporting a huge armament program in the guise of national defense, which, in reality, is nothing but a smoke screen to obscure the depression and economic failures of the New Deal.

[Laughter and applause.]

I feel strongly that in the midst of a depression, with 12,000,000 unemployed, it is not sound policy or logical to cut down relief for our destitute on the one hand and spend billions for superarmaments and destructive purposes on the other. If we have billions to spend, it should be spent for the benefit and welfare of our own people in promoting their health and well-being, and to help the one-third of our population who, according to President Roosevelt, are ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed.

The American people cannot have their cake and eat it, too. We cannot spend billions on destructive purposes and have billions to spend for constructive and useful purposes. The people must decide whether they want to follow the sound advice of Thomas Jefferson or the pump-priming schemes of President Roosevelt.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Who made those statements?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I am reading from his radio speech. [Laughter and applause.]

Referring, now, to the people of the United States:

They are being led to believe that we are as defenseless as Ethiopia and China, and about to be invaded.

I shall not read further, but he went on to say that he was opposed to the air expansion program, that we did not need any 6,000 planes, as a matter of fact the 5,300 authorized at that time were more than ample to defend this country against anything.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FISH. That is just what I said, but we have not the 5,300, and that is what I would like to see us have. We have them authorized, but we have not the planes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that, but at the same time, the gentleman voted against that program; or rather, was paired against it, a program which would have authorized our Nation to get some of the armaments which he condemns us today for not having; and I want to say to you again, in his own words, that the American people cannot have their cake and eat it too. The only way we can get armaments is to spend the money that he said we should not spend. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RUTHERFORD].

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I favor the passage of this bill, H. R. 9850, as a means of expediting and strengthening national defense. I have always believed in adequate national defense, and by national defense I mean the defending of the greater part of the Western Hemisphere. We must be prepared to prevent any foreign country obtaining a foothold, other than that which that country now holds, on any part of the Western Hemisphere. To do this it is going to take tremendous sums of money, and we must be prepared to make some large sacrifices in the future. We must do first things first; and, to my mind, preparing to make it impossible and undesirable for any nation to attack us is our first and foremost duty. It therefore seems to me that we in this country must put aside the doing of many desirable projects for the present, because we have not sufficient money to adequately prepare ourselves with a proper national defense and at the same time spend money on these other projects, no matter how desirable they may be. We are already nearly \$45,000,000,000 in debt. Our interest charges are over a billion dollars a year. It seems to me that we cannot go on borrowing money and borrowing money without limit without seriously

affecting our national economy. Washington, in his Farewell Address, said:

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it—avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burthen which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate.

We would do well to heed the advice therein given. That this administration has not done. We have already accumulated a debt that will be a serious burden upon many generations yet to come, and this bill for an adequate national defense should be paid for in part by this generation and not all saddled on future generations.

I believe that the administration should bring out a special tax bill for the purpose of raising a substantial part of this expense, and it could do it if it would. But I know that it will not be done, as this is election year and the New Deal administration thinks that it would not be wise to raise taxes, no matter for what purpose, in an election year. But, Mr. Chairman, the bills will have to be paid sometime, and we might as well start now. If we are compelled to maintain a large standing army, a two-ocean navy, and a large air force for several years to come, the future generations will have a real problem of raising funds to maintain them, and we should therefore do our part now by paying a share of the present expense. A great many people of the country seem to think that the President's rearmament speech to Congress last week was purely for political purposes and for the further purpose of covering up his negligence in not advising the people on these matters long before this. In this connection, I call attention to part of an article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson in the Evening Star under date of May 23. I quote:

It (the Midwest) is shocked to learn at so late a date that this administration, while spending so many millions for boondoggling and some useful works has permitted us to remain so delinquent in defense that we have practically no armament against the dreadful weapons of modern war. It is beginning to realize that it has not heretofore been told the truth about this defenselessness.

It is especially indignant to learn that as early as 1933 when Hitler started the "mechanization and motorization of Army tactical units" which is now conquering civilization, and which then erased the unemployment problem in Germany, Mr. Roosevelt was authorized by Congress to spend any part of \$3,300,000,000 that he chose for the same purpose—and spent it and many billions more for other and far less necessary purposes.

Mr. Roosevelt made an effective rearmament speech and got a lot of applause. But the facts are leaking out that he was making a virtue out of his own neglect and inaction in defense, that the appropriation he asked for was unplanned and inadequate. That the speech and the subsequent coalition Cabinet stuff was pure third-term politics and had little to do with increased industrial defense production—which is the essence of our problem.

There is a great deal of truth in what General Johnson says, but nevertheless we will have to pass over the mistakes of this administration and start out afresh to put ourselves on a sufficient adequate defense basis. In doing this we would have the advice of the great industrialists of the country. Men who from long experience know how to carry on mass production. There is no person in Government service who knows anything about mass production and it will be utter folly to leave the work involved in the defense program solely in the hands of the Army, Navy, Treasury, or any other department of the Government. This defense problem is one of mass production and we must have the help of those men who know how to handle such matters. I trust that this administration will see the necessity of calling in men of mass-production experience so that we can adequately prepare ourselves in the quickest possible time and at the minimum of expense. [Applause.]

MR. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

MR. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, we all listened with great interest to the President's message on preparedness and

national defense last week. I expect to support this bill. There should be no partisanship shown in its consideration, and I congratulate most heartily the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], also the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], who spoke only a few moments ago. I congratulate them upon their explanation of the bill which is the result of the President's message.

There is no more vital question before the American people today than that of national defense, and certainly we all must strive to protect the interests of our country and promote its security.

The President's request for additional defense funds is universally acknowledged to be necessary. Recent events in Europe have brought home to us the inadequacy of our own defenses. New methods of warfare have been developed, and new types of guns, bombs, tanks, and so forth are being used. The airplane has become one of the principal weapons of offense, rather than a mere auxiliary arm. Improvements have been made in plane construction and armament which make our own small air force outmoded. We have been made to realize that our own defenses need both building up and modernization. This is an age of new types of warfare, calling for new methods of defense, and in this we must be as effective as any of the nations of the world.

The security of our Nation is our most important responsibility at this time. Therefore, I am prepared to support every reasonable request the President has made or will make for strengthening our national defense. [Applause.] I have, however, many times said that I would not go to the extent of authorizing by my vote here in the Congress a return of the procedure of 1917. In other words, I can see no circumstances under which I could be induced to again vote to send our men overseas to fight in foreign wars. [Applause.] However, that is not an issue here today, and let us hope it never will be again. The American people, in my judgment, are united in their desire to prevent our men participating in the war.

Preparedness really is insurance against war, in that it will make it less likely that we will ever be attacked. To that extent, I feel that the bill now before us will avoid the necessity of our boys having to take up arms to defend our own shores from invasion.

It must be realized, of course, that the mere appropriation of money, although it is being done with the utmost speed, does not itself assure us an adequate defense. The President's expressed desire for an air force of 50,000 planes will still be far from fulfillment with the enactment of the pending bill. Time will be required to expand plant facilities, train personnel, and build the planes.

It is estimated that a total of seven billions will have to be appropriated to pay for and maintain them when built. Pilots must be trained to operate them.

The sudden thrusting of the defense question before the country at this time, especially under the circumstances which gave rise to it, has created somewhat of a hysteria. If ever calm and deliberate judgment was needed, it is now. We should not rush pell-mell into a course of action without making sure we are on the right track.

It seems to me that what should be done first is to find out just where we stand—in other words, to take inventory—then we should decide what needs to be done. After that, we should determine the best way to get it done. We need not only military advice on these questions, but also the advice of those who would have to carry out the industrial end of the program, which perhaps is the most pressing phase.

Certain questions arise out of the President's address that I think should bear analysis. In the first place, I cannot altogether approve of a blank-check appropriation of \$200,000,000 in the hands of any individual. It is too great a responsibility. I am not suggesting that we cannot trust the President to spend this money wisely. Rather, I feel

that it is a responsibility which Congress itself should discharge. Congress makes the law. The Executive is only supposed to administer it.

I have always been opposed to blank-check appropriations of any kind, and I see no reason for making an exception of those connected with national defense. Congress not only has the right to pass upon these matters, it has a duty to do so. If we are going to be part of the team, we ought to participate in every detail of the defense program.

In the second place, I think the President should take Congress into his confidence and give us the benefit of all the information he has dealing with the question of national defense. The President in his defense message said that the Congress and the Chief Executive constitute a team where the defense of the land is concerned. That, of course, is true. The Executive has his responsibilities and the Congress has its responsibilities. They must both pull together if we are to get anywhere.

I am sure that the President can count upon the fullest cooperation of the Congress without regard to party. It seems to me, however, that the President owes it to the Congress to give us the benefit of all information he has on the subject.

If we are to vote intelligently on these matters, we must know what the facts are. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] brought this subject up in the other body last Monday, in connection with an article appearing in the New York Times of May 18. That article called attention to the appointment by the President last fall of a War Resources Board, composed of outstanding men in whom the public has the greatest confidence. This Board made a preliminary report to the President on October 18 and a final report on November 3. To date, however, that report has never been made public, and so far as I know has not been made available to any committee of the Congress. It is possible that there are reasons why the report should not be made public. However, there can be no justification for its complete suppression, at least so far as the responsible congressional committees are concerned.

Why has not the President given us the benefit of the information that this able group submitted to him? We are a part of the great General Government of the United States, and we should have such information as will aid us in governing our actions as he himself has. It is a copartnership, as I see it, existing here today. We are sent here by our constituents to represent their interests, and certainly we are entitled to all the information that is obtainable.

There are two other features I would like to refer to in my brief time and one has to do particularly with the question of paying for this defense and the emergency that exists. I have no information on the war situation, but I do know something about the finances of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have two things in mind, Mr. Chairman. First of all, we should share in paying for this national defense by a new tax bill at this session of Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.] Further than that, we should remain here on the job, not go home and be subject to the call of a special session. [Applause.] If this tremendous emergency exists, we are responsible to those who have sent us here, exactly as the President of the United States is responsible to all of the people. Therefore I say that it is our duty to see this thing through the emergency, whatever may occur back home. We should stay on the job until the emergency is over. [Applause on the Republican side.]

While the President, in his defense message, made no reference to the means of financing the preparedness program, this all-important question cannot be ignored. The only money the Government has to spend is that which it raises by taxation and that which it is able to borrow. Present tax revenues are only about half what are needed

to pay current Government costs. As a result of 10 years of deficit financing the authorized debt limit, which is fixed by law at forty-five billions, is virtually exhausted. If we are to have a defense program, ways and means must be found to finance it.

It is idle to pass appropriation bills if the Treasury has no money to spend and no authority to borrow further. We are faced with two alternatives: We must either levy new taxes to pay for the defense program or the debt ceiling must be raised. We ought to decide here and now as to what method we are going to use to finance it.

I have felt for a long time that the Nation's credit was being undermined by excessive borrowing. Certainly any large increase in the present authorized debt limit would be risky. As between the two alternatives of taxes and further borrowing, I would favor additional taxes.

Of course, there are limits beyond which we cannot go as regards taxes, but, in my opinion, we should completely exhaust the tax field before borrowing further. Since the money is to be used to pay for present-day defense, it should be raised by present-day taxes. I realize we could not finance a war by taxes alone, but we ought to be able to finance a large part of the defense program by that method. We should not pass on the whole burden to future generations, and jeopardize our financial security by so doing.

We should settle this matter now and not wait until after the elections. We are going to have to face the question later on, and we might just as well get it over with, so that the people may tighten up their belts and make arrangements to pay the coming tax burden. I am sure the people will gladly contribute taxes for national defense which they would not willingly contribute for waste and extravagance.

Great stress is laid upon the need for military strength, but we should not close our eyes to the fact that financial security is our first line of defense. In my opinion, the Secretary of the Treasury should be called before the Ways and Means Committee for the purpose of informing the committee as to the effect of the defense program on the national finances and as to the Treasury's recommendations for financing the same.

While it is true, as the President has said, that the important thing is to get the defense program under way, the means of financing it is more than a mere detail. It is an urgent and pressing problem which this Congress should have the courage to face before it adjourns. Therefore I appeal to the House to make secure not only our military defenses but our financial defense as well. At present the latter is the point of our greatest vulnerability.

This Congress will do only half the job when it passes the military and naval defense measures. It should stay here and finish its work by evolving ways and means of paying for the program without undermining the economic security of the Nation. It is neither statesmanlike nor safe to put this inescapable problem off until after the election.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BOEHNE].

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Chairman, we are considering and are about to pass legislation designed to materially increase the defenses of this country. In order that the people may know the full meaning of this action, in which I believe they and we heartily approve, I call upon this Congress, and particularly my party, to enact tax legislation which will raise a substantial amount of revenue. Being a member of the tax subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee, I am ready to discharge that responsibility. The quicker we get down to business on this important matter, the better it will be.

To those who subscribe to the political doctrine that new or additional taxes should not be levied in an election year, I need only to remind that one of our duties is to see to it that our credit structure remains sound particularly in times like these.

I have consistently opposed increases in appropriations this year, and in many instances voted to decrease appropriations

under budget requirements, because I was opposed to a further lift of our debt limitation. Because of uncertain world conditions, because of the necessity for a sudden necessary increase in the defenses of our Nation, that opposition has melted away. The debt limitation must soon be raised, but under no conditions should that be done without the imposition of additional taxes.

Just what form these new taxes should take is the problem of those who will have the responsibility of bringing in the necessary legislation. At the moment, I am not necessarily interested in how this money should be raised. We can drastically reduce personal exemptions. We can increase normal rates. We can remove the earned income credit. We can levy a horizontal rate on total income taxes due. We can materially increase surtaxes on net incomes from \$5,000 to \$25,000, a source from which considerable revenue may be extracted. We can increase corporation rates. We can increase consumption rates. Whatever may be the method to be employed, I am primarily interested in making a start now, a study that will be translated into immediate action.

Under the Constitution of the United States, the House of Representatives has the sole right to originate all bills for raising revenue, and there is no valid excuse for us to shirk our responsibilities in that direction now.

The question of a debt limitation for our Government is a very interesting one. I believe that, strictly speaking, the point at which the indebtedness of our Nation reaches its limit is entirely flexible and not static. In a day of teeming prosperity, a \$45,000,000,000 limitation would no doubt be a low limitation. In a day of adversity and depression, that figure might far exceed the danger point. The present limitation in our 1940 economy is not too high, but I am convinced that it is immediately necessary to raise additional funds in order that we remain financially sound for any emergency which may occur in the near future. The argument that we simply owe all of this money to ourselves is too thin for me. Government bonds are a distinct obligation of a sovereign government, and when that sovereign government finds itself in a position where it cannot meet its own obligations, default occurs, which leads to repudiation, the forerunner of bankruptcy. I believe in being realistic at all times, because theories have never been known to fight a winning battle against facts.

I, therefore, plead with my colleagues to forget political differences at the moment. We will probably have enough of those next fall, but now the business of government demands our instant attention. Let us display that same unity of action in the question of raising sufficient revenues as I know we will in enacting proper defense measures. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER].

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, while it is true it was only a week ago yesterday that the President appeared in this Chamber and delivered to us his message on national defense, since that time your Committee on Military Affairs has given careful consideration to the subjects discussed in that message and the necessity for a revision upward of our national-defense plans. The committee heard members of the General Staff of the Army and officials of the War Department during the past week.

Of course, over the period of the last few years your committee which has been giving consideration to the problems of national defense has realized that if we were going to have adequate defense in this country it must be measurably increased. Events of the last 2 or 3 weeks have convinced not only the Members of the Congress but the people of this country that the will for peace is not enough. We not only must have a desire for peace but we must have the defense if we are going to have peace. [Applause.]

We know what the situation was in the Scandinavian countries. Denmark did not desire war. Norway had no wish to have her territory overrun, her people mercilessly destroyed; and now Holland and Belgium have been subjected to the same fate. Many of us have given thought to the problems of defense during the last few years, and we

have always been of the opinion that our geographical location was our greatest defense asset. We are now faced with the possibility—and it is a real probability—that should Germany win this war and take from France and Great Britain their navies, with the ships that are under construction in those countries, she would possess a navy far outstripping ours in strength and effectiveness. So that there is a possibility that we will have to face a first-class offensive against the United States in the years to come. It should be our duty as Representatives of the people to see that this Nation is prepared to meet any offensive that may be brought against us. We are face to face with grim reality. Never did America desire peace more than she does now.

I have little fear at the present time that we will be drawn into the conflict in Europe, and I say that as a practical matter, for the very reason that we do not have the war matériel, we do not have the guns and munitions of war that would make our weight amount to anything in the scales in Europe. We do not have the modern equipment that we could take to the other side that would mean anything in the battles that are waging over there. We have no heavy tanks. We have very few anti-aircraft guns. We have scarcely any anti-tank guns. There are numerous modern, up-to-date necessary items of armament in which we are woefully deficient. Our small army is efficient, well officered, and made up of courageous, intelligent Americans. They are entitled to modern equipment.

This bill not only gives authorization for appropriations presently to be made to strengthen our national defense but permits suspension of limitations in number of planes and flying cadets and suspends operation of certain statutes relative to construction so that necessary building may proceed without needless delay.

As far as aircraft is concerned, the purchase of 200 large, 4-motored bombers and the acquisition of 2,200 additional training planes only is contemplated. You will remember the President mentioned in his message the matter of the production capacity in this country of 50,000 planes. Of course, that is going to take months and years to accomplish. You cannot increase aircraft production in this country to any such figure except over a considerable length of time. Happily, our aircraft industry is in a healthy condition. The orders it has received from abroad has helped to build it up, has given it the activity that it otherwise would not have had, and I believe we are turning out planes that are comparable in performance and speed with any that are produced elsewhere.

It is true the battlefields of Europe are proving to be a great testing ground for all types of airplanes. We are learning lessons that must be incorporated in the planes that we are having delivered to us. They must mount more and heavier-caliber guns and must carry more armament to protect the pilot and crew. This costs money, and all of us who read and hear what is taking place in Europe realize the importance of military aviation today. The air arm in the operations by Germany on the western front has in large part supplanted artillery as it was used during the World War, and we realize that the difficulties of France and Great Britain today are due to the aircraft and the mechanized, motorized equipment of Germany. It is essential that we have an adequate air force in this country.

We do not need at this time 50,000 planes, but we do need to increase our productivity and production of planes so that if an emergency should confront us we will be in position to supply the planes to our armed forces at a very rapid rate.

The items to be purchased, the enlargement of facilities, have been explained to the Military Committee by the Chief of Staff and other officers and representatives of the War Department. They are our experts, our technical advisers. Pray God they have taken good account of the German war machine, for we want the very latest and best weapons money will buy and we can produce. The responsibility rests with the General Staff of the Army and the General Board of the Navy. The American people and their representatives—the Congress—will not hesitate to spend what may be necessary to protect the Nation from attack and keep us at peace;

but we want no bungling, no waste, and we demand the use of the very best judgment of which our staffs are capable.

I shall offer later an amendment, on page 4 of the bill, which is merely a perfecting amendment, to which I wish to call the attention of the Committee:

Page 4, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "which may be made immediately and continuously available until June 30, 1942", and insert in lieu thereof "which may be made continuously available during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942."

This is to cover the constitutional provision that Congress cannot make an appropriation for more than 2 ensuing years.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman has traveled a great deal and has inspected lots of Army posts and Air Corps installations and talked with a great many of the soldiers in the United States Army. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that as far as the morale of the soldier in the United States Army is concerned and his individual ability that our Army ranks on a par with any other army in the entire world?

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. There is no question about it; and the American soldier has proved it time and time again. I believe the morale, the courage, and the fighting ability of our soldiers is just as great today as at any time in our history. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote for the defense bills for both the Army and Navy. In doing so, I do it with some reluctance. Not because I do not believe in national defense, but I am in the dark as to just what will become of the money when it is appropriated.

There has been over \$7,000,000,000 that has been appropriated during the present administration, and I am now told we are wholly unprepared, that we have only 58 airships that are not obsolete. To me, it is a tragedy that we, as a Nation, have been asleep.

We have been asleep, not only with our national defense, but in other matters as well. What have we to show for the other billions that have been spent in an increase of material wealth of the Nation?

I wish that there was something Congress could do to make the people of this Nation think. The only way I know of doing it is by asking them to pay some of this money now. We cannot go on as we have been during the past seven and a half years. The last Treasury statement I seem to have is May 21. It shows our public debt to be \$42,772,285,920.32. Besides this we have guaranteed obligations of some six billion more. Our excess of expenditures over receipts this year on May 21 was \$3,352,509,292.12.

We are approaching our debt limit fixed by Congress of \$45,000,000,000. I am not going to vote to increase that limit without some taxes being first levied. The people of America do not want me to vote to increase it. They would much prefer, although it hurts to do so, pay now as we go. If we do, we will spend much less. You will find that out. Let us give the people a few lessons in economics.

Daniel Webster, in 1834, was very much concerned with respect to this important matter of economic education. He said:

I admonish every industrious laborer in this country to be on guard against those who would perpetrate against them a double fraud—a fraud to cheat them out of their earnings by first cheating them out of their understandings. The very man above all others who has the deepest interest in sound currency, and who suffers most by mischievous legislation, is the man who earns his daily bread by his daily toil. A vast majority of us live by industry. The Constitution was made to protect this industry, to give it both encouragement and security; but above all, security.

The immortal, stalwart southern Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, in his day on the same subject, had this to say:

To preserve our independence we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

Then there is another point. Do we fully realize where the money is coming from to meet the charges of government? Here are the words of another great southern Democrat, Senator BYRD:

We work under the load of the most stupendous debt any nation has ever carried. Our taxes are reaching the point of diminishing returns, and today are a decided factor in the high cost of living. Remember that more than half of the taxes collected by the Federal Government come from invisible taxation paid by the housewife, the laborer, and everyone who eats or buys necessities.

Last year 43 citizens had incomes of over \$1,000,000, and the aggregate of these incomes was \$73,000,000. If we confiscated all the incomes of these millionaires, the money obtained would operate the National Government for only about 3 days. The rich must bear a just share, yet these figures prove the futility of confiscating property to sustain our great expenditures.

People, the victims of regimentation, now realize the tragic truth—that a dictator is nothing more than a receiver for a nation gone bankrupt.

Why was it that the Black Shirts were able to march upon Rome without resistance and take over the reins of government? It was Italy's debt that spelt its doom.

It was not until the German Government and its political subdivisions had incurred indebtedness and assumed obligations far beyond their power to meet; it was not until their bonds and their promises to pay had become worthless scraps of paper that the German people looked for and hailed the one who should come forward with a promise and pledge to lift them out of their hopelessness. And that man came. But before he came, tragic inflation, following national bankruptcy, had taken its toll.

Not so long ago, in the memory of most of us who are here today, at the height of German inflation, the hundreds of thousands of Germans who looked forward to economic security in their old age, as a result of their savings accumulated in life-insurance policies, were handed worthless currency. The same can be said concerning those who had savings accounts. The insurance companies actually lost 93.5 percent of their assets and 95.6 percent of their investments. That inflation did not come by Government proclamation; it developed slowly, as it always does, until the final stages, when it assumes the proportions of a prairie fire, consuming all the substance of the people. There remained a despoiled nation. Then came the emergency, then chaos, then the dictator, who, as I have already said, is nothing more than a receiver for a nation gone bankrupt.

Loss of confidence in its money, which, in the final analysis, is inflation, is the greatest tragedy that can happen to any civilized state.

Let us vote money for national defense, and before this Congress adjourns enact legislation, or a tax bill, that will bring in sufficient funds to take care of the amount appropriated. As a loyal American citizen, I am ready to pay my share. I am sure all loyal American citizens feel the same way about it. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I sat in the Chamber a few minutes ago with real sadness and genuine regret to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] continue his campaign of prejudice and hate. It seems to me that if there ever was a time in the history of this Congress when we ought to forget that we are Democrats or Republicans and prove ourselves to be Americans it is now. [Applause.]

The world is sick, and one has but to read the headlines in any paper throughout the length and breadth of this country, or of the world, to know that America faces a crisis; and, more than that, that civilization itself is at the crossroads and that Christianity and democracy are on trial. [Applause.]

I deny, too, the reference of the gentleman regarding the Army of the United States when he said in substance, if not words, that we have a weak and ineffective Army. I undertake to say that we do not have the largest army in the world, but in personnel and morale we have the finest army in the world today. [Applause.] And I am willing to go further than that and say that it is an army that has

carried a flag like that above the Speaker's stand to victory in every contest in which it has been engaged. I go further and make the prediction that it will continue to do so, because this country will never go to war for any cause that is not just and right; and I happen to belong to that school of thought which believes that justice and right will triumph in the end.

But I call the attention of the gentleman to this fact because I speak from some experience. I make no profession or claims to being an expert on military affairs. Nevertheless for 9 long years now I have sat upon the House Military Affairs Committee, a membership which I prize highly. It is a high-minded, nonpolitical, and nonpartisan committee interested only in national defense. Time after time during those 9 years we have brought to the floor of this House the recommendations of the President, whether he was Mr. Hoover or Mr. Roosevelt. We have come with the recommendations of the Secretary of War, regardless of his politics, and likewise of the Chief of Staff. And if there is any fault or blame today, it rests upon the shoulders not of our Army, not of the President, not of the Secretary of War, not of the Chief of Staff, but on the shoulders of Congress, including men like the gentleman from New York, who has voted against nearly everything that has been proposed by the Democrats. [Applause.]

I join with my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] in his sentiments. I agree with my able friend, because there is no finer man in this House than the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]. He believes in adequate provision for national defense. He does not play politics with that question. Likewise my distinguished friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], who holds the rank of colonel, and, in my judgment, knows more about the practical side of this problem than probably any other Member of the House. I join with them in their tribute to the Chief of Staff, General Marshall. [Applause.] I would like to say that when I came to Congress the Secretary of War was none other than brilliant Patrick Hurley, of a political faith opposite to mine. Later he was followed by Mr. Dern, I believe, of Utah; and he was followed by the able, patriotic, and sincere Harry Woodring. Along with Pat Hurley back in those days was a brilliant and scholarly Chief of Staff, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Pat Hurley and General MacArthur brought their recommendations to the House Committee on Military Affairs and we recommended them to the Congress—for a larger Air Corps and more mechanized equipment.

The recommendations went to the Appropriations Committee, but the cry of peace and economy was sounded. Many of the recommendations were turned down. And now the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] says we have a pitiful army. Not only that but following Gen. Douglas MacArthur there came another Chief of Staff than whom there is not a finer man in all this Nation both in ability and patriotism, and that is Gen. Malin Craig. [Applause.] Yet when he came to present the Nation's military need to the Congress he had to beg and plead for the comparatively small appropriations he received. So let us be fair and take the blame ourselves, for that is where it belongs. I have faith and confidence in our Army; give them the money to get the men, supplies, and equipment and they will do the job.

Some of our Republican friends cry out that \$7,000,000,000 has been wasted. I deny that charge and say that every cent of that money has been expended in the exact way the Congress directed without any waste or graft.

Only last year when there were recommendations here from the Committee on Military Affairs and likewise from the Committee on Appropriations, they met with very stubborn opposition. The record will show that those who criticize our Army today have opposed all suggestions coming from the majority side affecting preparedness and neutrality.

It seems to me that at this critical time we ought to forget our partisanship. This bill is very simple in its terms because it does nothing but suspend existing statutes relative to limitations. There is a clause in the printed bill waiving civil-service requirements, which I gave notice yesterday I would

offer an amendment to strike, but I understand the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has said for himself, and I presume he spoke for the committee, that he proposed to offer that amendment himself. So after you dispose of that part of the bill which suspends existing statutes and places full authority and confidence in the War Department, the only thing left is the last section to which some reference has been made which allocates a fund of \$132,000,000 to the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a time, as I view it, to worry about naming the President or his political party. I do not care what his name is or what his politics may be. He is the Commander in Chief of the United States Army. [Applause.] Not only that, but if you will read your history you will find that back in the dark days of the War between the States this body, where we are sitting today, gave to Abraham Lincoln what it regarded as sufficient funds to meet the exigencies of that day. Furthermore, this Congress, including the Democrats, in the dark days of the Spanish-American War, when that great Republican President, William McKinley, was Commander in Chief, voted him a tremendous sum of money, as considered in those days, to meet the emergencies of a war situation. Further than that, when the terrible World War came on, this Congress, regardless of politics, said to Woodrow Wilson, Commander in Chief of the United States Army, "We are out to win this war," and the RECORD shows it voted him a very large sum of money to meet situations that nobody could predict.

Let me refer again to our able and experienced Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, who was General Pershing's right-hand man in France. Somehow or other I have an idea that he knows more about World War conditions and also practical military affairs in this day of modernization and mechanization than any other American. When he came before our committee he stated, "Why, of course, conditions will arise about which no man can make a prediction." Therefore the President of the United States, no matter who he is, should in a crisis like this have a fund at his disposal to meet any emergency.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has referred to these Presidents when we were in a war. As I understand it, these emergency appropriations to a President were made in the course of a war.

Mr. THOMASON. I cannot see where there is any difference, if you will just look at what is going on in Europe today. If the people of the United States have just cause for the fear they feel today, if we expect to get ready to defend ourselves against the terrible day when we might be attacked, why not have the materials and supplies necessary to meet any kind of an emergency? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I think the gentleman will find that the grant to President McKinley, which was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives and by the Senate as well, as I now recall, was made some time before the declaration of war.

Mr. THOMASON. I think my friend from Colorado is right and I thank him for the information. In this connection let me say I very much hope that partisan politics is about to adjourn in America until this crisis is over. We ought to be a united people on this issue. It certainly must have been refreshing to every American citizen to learn that when the Army bill came up in the Senate of the United States 74 Senators, regardless of politics, 2 or 3 of them prominently mentioned for the office of President of the United States on the opposition party, cast their votes for that bill without a vote against it. The same was true when it came to the passage of the Navy bill yesterday. Seventy-eight Senators, feeling that a crisis existed in the world and

that this Nation itself is in danger, cast their votes for that bill without a vote against it. I hope that we may enjoy the same experience about 2 hours from now in this House and that not a single vote will be cast against the bill. It is a grave situation, and I beg and plead for unity when it comes to adequate national defense.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am quite confident the gentleman's hope will be realized when we vote on this bill, but I call his attention to the fact that the House of Lords as one of the two English Parliaments day before yesterday in 150 minutes passed war legislation much more stringent than this.

Mr. THOMASON. Of course, our hindsight is always better than our foresight. When you look back on the history of 3 years ago you will find a small minority of thinking citizens in the Allied Nations of the world begging and pleading for adequate defense, the majority not dreaming of the powerful military machine that was in the making by their enemies. It is refreshing to know that in America we are waking up and we are not going to be caught in any such situation. America and its free institutions must and will be preserved regardless of cost.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman knows that many of us on both sides of the House, Republicans and Democrats, have voted for every single preparedness item. I for one have voted for every preparedness measure that has come before the Congress, and I shall continue to do so.

Mr. THOMASON. I am sure there is no Member of this House who has a better record for military preparedness than the distinguished and able gentlewoman from Massachusetts, and I am happy in the thought that she is giving this program her wholehearted support regardless of politics. I repeat that it is no time to think and act as a Democrat or a Republican; it is time to think and act and vote as an American. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I agree with the gentleman from Texas, my colleague on the Committee on Military Affairs, that we should do everything we possibly can to improve our defenses. I am with him 100 percent on this bill. I want to make one reference to what our chairman said in regard to the action taken by the House of Lords the other day. The House of Lords also changed horses in midstream; and, believe me, the stream over there is a lot deeper than it is here. I think we should do it here, too.

Mr. THOMASON. From what I know of the temper of the American people, there is not much danger of any change of horses in this country very soon. There is red-blooded Americanism in every drop of Roosevelt blood that I have ever heard about, and that includes every branch of that famous and patriotic family. The people of this country have confidence in the present occupant of the White House. My plea today, however, is for a united America and the preservation of her liberty and free institutions. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES].

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, in spite of what the distinguished gentleman from Texas said concerning partisanship and all that, which is injected here without any rhyme or reason, I am going to vote for this appropriation for national defense not as a Republican but as an American citizen. [Applause.] I am going to vote for it in spite of the fact that there has been spent in 1937, 1938, and 1939, \$1,217,000,000 by the Army, and the total amount of money

used for new equipment was less than \$117,000,000 out of this great sum. By that token, if we spend the same proportion out of \$1,182,000,000 we will spend only \$180,000,000 for real equipment.

I recall the days of 1917 and of 1914, when I was writing headlines on the newspapers and this country was jittery because of the impregnable power of the juggernaut sent over the plains of Belgium and northern France by Germany in almost the same way it is being done now. I also remember in 1922 listening to the debates of this Congress and the exposure of the enormous waste that occurred in the World War; of the millions upon millions of dollars that were thrown away, and the extraordinary amount of graft there was in it because of the political significance in many aspects.

One statement was made that the National Industries Board at that time was instituted for a holy cause and used for an unholy purpose. I want no money appropriated by this Congress for the War Department or the Navy or for which I vote for a holy cause used for an unholy purpose.

When you stop to think of it, you will find that \$380,000,000 was spent by the War Department out of the 1937 funds and only 2.8 percent was used for new equipment, for making a new army. In 1938 \$405,000,000 was spent and only 1.66 percent was used for equipment. In 1939 \$455,000,000 was spent and only 5 percent was expended for new equipment. Some of the old equipment like our old used cars was patched up. I should like to know, and I should like to see a report on it, although I have not been able to get it, exactly where all the \$1,227,000,000 that was spent in those 3 years went through the War Department. Was it to build new \$25,000 houses at Army posts for the officers? What was the money used for? Of more than \$1,000,000,000 of total appropriations spent by the Army not a cent of it was used for new equipment to put this Army in the field.

I am willing to vote for the appropriation of even \$10,000,000,000 to put this country in a perfect state of defense against foreign invasion. We will have to spend it before we get through. This bill provides for only an infinitesimal sum, an experimental sum. It is the use, not the amount, but the use, the place where it goes, where it is spent, and for what purpose, what you are going to get out of it, that counts in defense.

I remember that we wasted millions of dollars during the World War. You remember the old story, that they bought spurs enough to prod every horse in Europe and then threw them onto the waste pile. Millions of dollars were thrown away. I do not want to see in the United States a repetition of that day or of the graft or scandal, which stank to high heaven, that came out of the World War in connection with the contracts and the armament of our troops. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been described, and properly so, as one to authorize the lifting of restrictions which will allow as much speed as possible in spending what money is made available now to build up the protective mobilization force which has been described to you earlier. This is not a bill for the enlargement of the existing organizations. This is primarily a bill to authorize some speeding up of the spending of the money we are going to make available very shortly. Everything in this bill, in my opinion, is absolutely necessary; in fact, were there more time, I believe the War Department would have brought in requests for additional funds.

I believe the War Department should bring in requests for funds for additional mechanization. We have in existence one brigade of mechanized troops. Unfortunately, most of our people believe that the so-called streamline divisions of the Regular Army today are mechanized divisions. They are not. They are not what is ordinarily referred to in military circles as either mechanized or motorized divisions. They are infantry divisions whose transport, which takes the place of the horses and the mules, is by motor, but they do

not travel by motor and they do not have a large percentage of armored vehicles to fight from.

I believe we should greatly increase the proportion of mechanized troops in the Army, and I hope the War Department will bring in a supplemental estimate and, if necessary, request additional authorization for men to man additional mechanized forces. The amount, the proportion, and the kind of weapons and equipment should be for our military men to decide, but it seems to me that at this time we should call upon them to bring in a report as to needed equipment. It is possible to modernize the protective mobilization plan in view of the lessons of the campaigns we have seen in Poland, as well as the more recent ones in Norway, Belgium, and Holland. This authorization is necessary, as I say, in order to speed up the equipment of the Army which is planned under the so-called protective mobilization plan. It is a minimum, and I hope there is no vote against it.

There is one addition to it which I shall offer and which I understand has been adopted by the Senate committee, in the way of an authorization of the prohibition of export of materials, machinery, or munitions which are necessary in the production of the equipment for our forces which we do not have a sufficient supply of in this country at this time. This would be an authorization to the President to prohibit exports of such equipment and materials. The authority would run until June 30, 1942. It is a broad grant of power to conserve the resources we do have in this country and to prevent their wastage at a time when we are trying to build up our own defensive strength. I feel this is necessary, and I feel that we should grant the power at this time. I feel that in the long run we should have a permanent policy which would set up some body to see in what critical materials there are shortages in this country and to control the export of those materials under a long-range program. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, while I intend to vote for this bill and I have supported all such legislation, I would like to put a proposition to the House that seems to me of considerable importance. For the last year and a half, since I have been a Member of this body, I have been going down to the War Department on occasions to find out about certain matters, part of them in connection with national defense. Every time any one of us asks a question of the War Department concerning national defense, he gets an answer, but it must be recognized that when the War Department or the Navy Department or any other department of this Government comes before the Congress, they are limited in the statements that they make before the various committees, especially the Appropriations Committee, by the Budget as it has been presented. They are not permitted to volunteer information on matters that are not approved by the Budget. Consequently, unless the Appropriations Committee members happen to ask questions sufficiently in detail to find out the exact condition of the Army, they will not find that out. They cannot find out either the condition or the full requirements unless they ask close questions of the representatives of those departments. It seems to me that for not only this period but for all future time the restrictions upon the military branches of our Government in connection with conditions and recommendations outside of the Budget should be lifted so that they may come to the committees of Congress direct, tell completely their needs, what the actual condition is, and how much money it will take, or to make recommendations as to how much money each year should be appropriated to these branches for national defense.

I make this simply as a suggestion. I do not know how it can be accomplished except by Executive order; but it seems to me very important that if the Congress of the United States is to know in what condition our armed forces are, they should be allowed to have the information directly from the heads of the departments concerned, without any restriction by the Budget Bureau. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, under authority granted to extend my remarks I wish to call attention to the woeful lack of adequate defense on the coast of southern California. On Armistice Day in 1938 the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Pasadena, my home city, organized a large and impressive parade. The War Department detailed an antiaircraft unit from Fort McArthur to be included in the parade, for which we were indeed grateful. On examination of this equipment I found that the searchlight unit was mounted on an old Cadillac truck of the vintage of 1918. I patted its sides as an old friend, for many a time I have ridden on just such a vehicle, and perhaps on that very same truck. I was amazed that it was still running, and even more amazed that the Army was called upon to keep such equipment in repair for so many years.

I was astounded to learn then that there were only three antiaircraft guns in the whole of southern California, and those were accompanied by antiquated auxiliary equipment. So when I came here to represent my district in the Congress I commenced to dig into the subject of national defense, and with particular reference to the part of the country from which I come. I am too ashamed of its deplorable condition to detail it here, but it is enough to say that we are 3,000,000 people in Los Angeles County with practically no defense against hostile attack if our fleet is disposed elsewhere.

Several months ago I found my way to the General Staff of the Army and asked one of its splendid officers direct questions concerning the coastal defenses of southern California and received direct answers. That is the sort of business I like to do. Shortly thereafter I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 449, calling upon the Secretary of War to report to the House of Representatives concerning the nature and adequacy of existing measures for the defense of the coast of southern California against hostile attack and asking certain definite and pertinent questions.

House Resolution 449

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to report to the House of Representatives concerning—

- (1) The nature and adequacy of existing measures for the defense of the coast of southern California against hostile attack.
- (2) What, if any, critical shortages in personnel or equipment for the United States Army exist which might jeopardize a successful defense of the coast of southern California.
- (3) The scope of existing harbor-defense projects and the adequacy of such projects when completed to provide a reasonable defense of the harbors of such coast.
- (4) The present stage of completion of existing harbor-defense projects in southern California, and the policy of the War Department as to their completion.

It was not thought advisable to make that information public, but in a letter from the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Military Affairs, to whose committee my resolution was referred, we are assured that attention will be given to our needs.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1940.

HON. CARL HINSHAW,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HINSHAW: You introduced a resolution (H. Res. 449) on March 29, 1939, directing the Secretary of War to report to the House of Representatives concerning the "nature and adequacy of existing measures for the defense of the coast of Southern California against hostile attack," and requiring certain direct information. The Speaker referred your resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs, of which, as you know, I have the honor to be chairman.

I have consulted the Secretary of War concerning your resolution, and it has been decided that while the information you seek is available, it is not advisable at this time to make it public except to say that the defenses of the coast of southern California are inadequate to repel hostile attack. However, the War Department has long since prepared plans for the defense of the coasts of the United States, and has vigorously pursued the carrying out of these plans within the sums requested by the President for this purpose, and appropriated to it by the Congress.

May I say that your resolution has brought this matter forcibly to the attention of the Committee on Military Affairs, and as its chairman I am arranging that the matter be thoroughly investigated by the committee during our recess, if any, between this session of the Congress and the next session, commencing January 3, 1941. It is planned that our committee will inspect the coast defenses of the United States, including those of southern

California, and I shall be pleased to notify you in advance of the time we intend to be in your vicinity.

Be assured that the purposes of your resolution will receive our most careful consideration, and that we are greatly interested in it.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. MAY,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, it will not take more than \$10,000,000 to prepare our coast defenses of southern California to protect our 3,000,000 people against hostile attack, and I hope the President will assign that much of the \$1,000,000,000 we will appropriate to that purpose. In addition, I hope he will order us antiaircraft guns and other equipment and provide adequate training for our National Guard in their use. I have been crying out for adequate national defense for many years as have many of my former comrades of the World War in the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is well nigh tragic that we now find ourselves still in that need and with a national debt that in itself is a serious obstacle. Defense we must have, and the obstacle must be overcome. There is no other right answer that I know of than to increase our taxes to pay for it. I hope it is not too late.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not for one moment subscribe to the belief that this Nation is in immediate danger of invasion. Neither do I place the slightest credence in the hysterical utterances of certain uninformed people who urge us to abandon or set aside the traditional and constitutional methods by which we have successfully guided this Nation along the entire route of our national existence and even through great civil strife.

We all admit that this is the time to adjourn politics; that this is the time to proceed with calm and dispassionate thoughts to the performance of our duty. We need not undermine the fundamental principles of our Government to accomplish that end. The greatest task before us now is the preservation of democracy here in the United States. If we are equal to that task we will make no compromise and follow no mode of procedure that is incompatible with the Constitution and the principles for which it stands.

Democracy is on trial, not on the battlefields of France and Belgium but here in this very Hall. Our actions will determine whether that form of government will stand unsullied on this continent.

In our deliberations on this bill two paramount objectives must be kept constantly in our minds: One, that our domestic problems are still with us and cannot be solved by hitching our cart to the so-called defense bandwagon; and two, this bill is in no manner designed to involve this Nation in war. It is our best insurance of continued peace.

Let no one be deceived. This program is a hardship our people must and are willing to assume. Eventually, the tremendous cost of this program, which we are merely beginning to approach at this time, will descend upon this generation and its posterity. It is true it is harsh, but it is unavoidable. It is imminently necessary. We have no alternative. We love America and our democracy. We will be far ahead in every way by acting now; by preparing now to defend our land, our homes, and our sacred liberty.

I am not predicting that we will be called upon to repel aggression against us. I am sure that I voice the thoughts and hopes of all here present in calling upon Divine Providence to so direct us that the weapons with which we are about to gird ourselves will never be drawn in battle. But we cannot close our eyes to the fact that other peoples in other lands cherishing their liberty and institutions quite as much as we love our own freedom and ideals have met with unbelievable disaster because they were not prepared to defend themselves.

While our armed forces, and especially the Army, is not prepared or fully equipped to a point of maximum efficiency, we still have time provided we act now. The great oceans that separate us from possible aggression are now and

have been for many years an integral part of our defenses. Let us take advantage of the protection thus afforded us while it is available to help us perfect our defenses while the waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific still offer a formidable deterrent against would-be aggressors.

Repeating again the firm conviction that this Nation will remain at peace, it would, nevertheless, be treasonable for the Congress and the Executive to remain inactive in the face of the lessons that arise every day out of the din of Europe's conflagration. We see now that old methods and old weapons are utterly incapable of withstanding the onslaught of new methods and new weapons. There were a few men of great vision who foresaw years ago what we all now admit to be true. Unfortunately their wise counsel fell upon deaf and prejudiced ears. No one now denies the tremendous importance of air power in modern war. Before our very eyes the greatest fleet in all the world has been rendered impotent at least to a considerable degree. The greatest army in all history is this minute suffering the most harrowing consequences and totters on the brink of ruin because it lacks a sufficient air auxiliary. The supremacy in the air possessed by one of the belligerents may not in itself assure final victory. I do not think that it will. But the effect of that supremacy will continue to exact its toll for a long time to come, not only from the armed forces but from the defenseless civilian population.

Even an eventual Allied victory will not wipe out the terrible consequences that have come about through inequality in the air. We are obligated by sacred duty to prevent such conditions from ever befalling this Nation.

This bill, as I have said, is insurance for peace. Gigantic though the appropriation sounds, it is barely adequate to begin the task of preparedness. It calls for the barest necessities in the way of efficient and modern weapons for our armed forces. It calls for a minimum of antiaircraft weapons; and it asks merely that our armed forces be given the best weapons that we can place in their hands. This bill is the beginning of a program that will give this Nation superiority in the air. When that goal is reached and not until then can we feel confident of the future destiny of our Nation. The funds that are asked will go a long way to establish the American forces as the best in the world. Our Navy is already without an equal. But our greatest deficiency remains in the air arm of defense. We have every reason and we have every necessary means at hand to provide our armed forces with the necessary and indispensable air auxiliary.

In considering the program of action called for by this bill do not forget that its success will call for the fullest cooperation from the entire civilian population and from industry and labor. With that thought in mind the committee has made provision for the expansion of existing facilities and the establishment of new facilities wherever needed. In order to assure the efficient carrying out of this vast program we must vest certain powers, certain discretion, and certain funds in the hands of the Executive to meet promptly items and emergencies that are bound to arise and which no legislative body can adequately anticipate so far in advance. In times like these the legislative branch must place confidence, great confidence, in the men who are charged with the duty of carrying out the job we give them. No matter what political party held forth at the White House I would readily agree in times like this to entrust into its hands the so-called emergency fund provided in section 2 of this bill. Faith in that conviction is not inconsistent with the Constitution in any manner.

Ever since I took my oath of office in this House, a war has been raging somewhere in the world and there has been talk of our involvement in war. On many occasions I have stood here before you and described my ideas and the methods by which I am convinced we can preserve our neutrality. I have always advocated a scrupulous neutrality in word and in deed. I, too, believe that we have no business choosing sides in the never-ending troubles of Europe and Asia. I have long been of the belief that our forefathers came to this land with that

very idea in mind. I have said before, and I repeat now, that I will never cast my vote to send one single American boy to his death on a battlefield in Europe or Asia. But my advocacy of scrupulous neutrality or, in you please, total neutrality does not for one moment dim my eyes to the grave duty that now calls us—the duty of building our defenses so strong that our land, our homes, our institutions, and our sacred ideals will stand untarnished and untouched by the hand of aggression. I repeat, this is not preparation for war; it is preparation for peace.

In closing, I wish to say that the Secretary of War, Harry Woodring, is one of the most capable and efficient Secretaries of War in the history of the United States, and under his leadership we can all feel confident that any expenditures under this or any other appropriation that this body may see fit to appropriate will be well spent and under his close scrutiny and supervision. We are indeed lucky to have him as the Secretary of War at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the great length of time of 2 minutes for debate on this bill! When request was made the other day to call this bill up, we asked the majority leader if we would have plenty of time to debate this measure, and we were told that we would. What time have we? You give a Member of the House 2 long minutes, and then they are liable to cut you short on that. It is a crime that we are being asked to pass this legislation in that way—gag legislation and dictatorship. Then there is section 2 of this bill, turning over everything to the President of the United States, and then it is said that the House will adjourn and we will go home. America in danger, and you go home. Is that what you Members of Congress were elected for? Is that what you were told to do—to turn your authority over to the President? What are you trying to do? What is this anyway? Is this a democratic and free country?

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman desire that I answer that question?

Mr. RICH. Well, I would like you to give me some more time or else answer it.

Mr. MAY. I would rather answer it; and I will say this: We are trying to protect this country and its people and its heritage from future possibilities. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. And you are trying to do that by turning the responsibility over to the President of the United States and Congress adjourning and going home, making a dictatorship Government. I tell you that the people back home do not want you to do that. They did not elect you to come here and do just the things that you are doing now—trying to cut short debate on a bill as important as this bill is to defend and take care of the people of this country. You give a Member 2 minutes, 2 long minutes, and then say you have not any more time. I say, Mr. Chairman, this is an outrage. [Applause.]

On Wednesday—page 6622 of the RECORD—when the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], requested of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], if we would have plenty of time for debate, we were promised that we would have plenty of time. The promise is now repudiated.

We all want this Nation prepared to protect our country, and I am for it 100 percent. What position are we in? The President stated we had prepared our country. In what respect? We have appropriated for national defense over a billion dollars each year 1938 and 1939. We have appropriated over \$2,000,000,000 for each year 1940 and 1941. We have given the President for emergency and relief during the past 7 years over \$20,000,000,000. Let the President give America an accounting and an inventory of his stewardship. He has had charge of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the aviation, and all branches of national defense. With all the money and authority for national defense, why are we in such a state of unpreparedness? Why did the President just wake up to the fact that the Bureau of Investigation should be transferred to the Department of Justice

to stop un-American activities in the United States? The President was informed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES], chairman of the Committee on Investigation of Un-American Activities, that subversive activities were going on in this country. Why did he not recognize it long ago? Is it possible that he did not believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES]? Why move the Department? Why not put someone as head of the Department of Labor that is 100-percent American that will insist on enforcing our laws? Now, gentlemen, let us be 100-percent American. Let us protect fully America, both without and within our borders. Let America live. Let America protect and enforce its laws. We can only do it by and with 100-percent loyal Americans. Let us protect our Constitution, our flag, and our people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN.]

I

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Military Affairs has held hearings and made a careful study of the President's message on national defense to determine what legislative authorization is needed. Obviously, the matter of increasing the authorized number of aircraft was one of the first issues to confront the committee, and after investigation of the productive capacity of the Nation and the need for building up that productive capacity, it was the opinion of the Committee on Military Affairs that no limit in number of planes should be established during the next 2 years, and this bill removes existing limitations up to July 1, 1942. If this bill is adopted, the number of airplanes to be produced prior to July 1, 1942, will have to be dependent upon the amount of money appropriated by Congress and the physical limitations of production by the aircraft industry.

Another major problem confronting our committee was the matter of increasing the number of flying cadets and pilots to insure proper augmentation of the Air Corps program and the training of pilots for service in our Air Corps has been developed to quite a high standard throughout the past years. It is the hope of the War Department that this high standard of training might be continued, but to do so and at the same time adequately expand the training program may tax the Air Corps to the utmost. There has been some thought of training 7,000 pilots per year. The number of applicants needed to produce 7,000 pilots per year has been variously estimated from 35,000 to 84,000. This figure alone will indicate something of the problem confronting us, as it may be very hard to find that many. An increase in the number of flying cadets to 8,500, as provided in this bill, will result in the graduation of 4,500 pilots by February 1942. In order to more rapidly augment our pilot-training program, authorization has been included for calling to active duty 6,000 Reserve Air Corps officers irrespective of grades. It is thought best to authorize calling older as well as younger Air Corps officers to active duty, as they form a very important element in our national-defense structure at this particular stage of our program.

One other major point of interest in this bill is the elimination of the civil-service requirements and the restrictions of law relating thereto in the employment of additional personnel for building our new armament, munitions, and Air Corps. It is most unfortunate that the committee has found it necessary to remove civil-service requirements and restrictions at this stage. When we remember that the civil service was used throughout the World War, it is indeed surprising that in peacetime and on a much smaller production program the civil-service requirements are deemed to be an impediment, for the elimination of civil service will leave the production program subject to the application of political patronage.

Another major point of this bill is the provision for the President's emergency fund. It was the desire of the committee to limit the expenditure of the emergency fund only in general terms within the field of national defense. It should not be overlooked that the bill provides that an

account shall be kept of all expenditures made or authorized under section 2, and reports of such expenditures and contracts shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each session. These reports are most important in order to keep Congress fully advised.

No authorization in this bill extends beyond June 30, 1942. The limitations contained in this bill will not impede the program of the President and the War Department, and the time limit set up in the bill avoids divesting Congress of control. I can see nothing about this bill to cause undue excitement or alarm, except possibly the provision eliminating the civil service. I intend to support the bill, because I think it is a very necessary and sensible move in building up our national defenses.

II

Let us turn now to the matter of the cost of our national defense. Other speakers have presented or will present considerable data and analysis to the cost of our national defense, but I think I should call your attention briefly to two or three points. We have had so much huge governmental spending in every conceivable way that our total Federal Budget and our total Federal debt have long since passed beyond our ability to comprehend its full significance and meaning. A sound domestic economy at this time would make us much more able to provide adequate defense. Regardless of that axiom, we are confronted with the need for adequate defense, and we must be realistic enough to go about the business of providing for adequate defense without the delay that is apparently needed to bring our domestic economy to a sound basis. The attention we are now forced to give to national defense does not minimize one bit our obligation to stabilize our domestic economy. Notwithstanding the fact that we hear on all sides that we have expended tremendous sums to maintain our Army and Navy, it is equally axiomatic that we must measure our expenditures for that purpose in comparison with the expenditures of the other powers.

The latest figures I have available are for 1938. In that year the total cost of our national defense was \$1,015,527,083, and the total cost of Federal, State, and local Governments was \$17,470,000,000. The percent of national defense to total government cost is 5.81 percent. For that same year, a comparison of our appropriations for national defense with our national income and a like comparison for other leading nations is as follows:

	National income	Appropriations, national defense	National defense in percent of national income
United States, 1938.....	\$63,993,000,000	\$942,335,183	1.47
United Kingdom, 1938.....	26,600,000,000	1,428,079,000	5.37
France, 1938.....	11,500,000,000	731,501,000	6.36
Italy, 1938.....	5,200,000,000	712,100,000	13.69
Germany, 1938.....	32,000,000,000	No data	
Japan, 1939.....	5,300,000,000	1,600,850,347	30.20

You will undoubtedly be interested in a comparison of the amounts of our War Department appropriations that have been allocated to ordnance. The percentage is as follows:

Fiscal year:	Percent
1910.....	8.72
1911.....	8.37
1912.....	8.38
1913.....	7.78
1914.....	8.42
1915.....	9.84
1916.....	13.10
1917.....	11.50
1918.....	54.70
1919.....	25.70
1920.....	2.55
1921.....	4.62
1922.....	3.59
1923.....	2.52
1924.....	2.26
1925.....	2.97
1926.....	2.89
1927.....	3.52
1928.....	4.04

Fiscal year—Continued.	Percent
1929.....	3.95
1930.....	3.57
1931.....	3.57
1932.....	3.31
1933.....	3.86
1934.....	2.54
1935.....	4.19
1936.....	5.47
1937.....	5.04
1938.....	6.19
1939.....	25.68

While we have no data on the expenditures of Germany for national defense in recent years, we have been told that our duplication of the huge war machine that has been built by Germany since 1933 would probably cost \$100,000,000,000. So the percentage of their national income that has been applied to build their war machine is much larger than that given for any other nation.

Another comparison of interest today is the percentage of our total Federal Budget represented by our appropriations for the War Department. The percentages from 1920 down to date are as follows:

Fiscal year:	Percentage of total Federal Budget
1920.....	14.6
1921.....	7.3
1922.....	7.8
1923.....	6.8
1924.....	6.3
1925.....	6.0
1926.....	6.9
1927.....	6.7
1928.....	6.6
1929.....	7.0
1930.....	8.3
1931.....	9.2
1932.....	8.8
1933.....	6.2
1934.....	2.9
1935.....	3.3
1936.....	4.5
1937.....	4.5
1938.....	5.4
1939.....	4.8
1940.....	10.0

To achieve a balanced domestic economy in the face of mounting costs of defense we must curtail all other expenditures, and we must insist on getting full value for the money we spend for defense. If we really intend to build adequate defenses against the huge armaments of the world today we must prepare ourselves to face the possibility of expenditures in the defense program far beyond anything we have yet experienced and far beyond the amount we would like to spend for that purpose. But an adequate defense is indispensable and our adjustments to meet that need will become very distasteful but necessary as the costs of defense mount up. These costs must be carefully watched at all times.

III

We are entering a phase of national defense that calls for especial watchfulness over the expenditure of our money and careful application of our energy for the task at hand. It is certainly no time for hysteria, and to the extent that we now lose our sense of balance we will pay in increased costs for the inefficiency that goes with hysteria. In asking that you discourage hysteria and wild clamor I do not ask that we diminish our speed in setting about the business at hand. I only wish it were possible to go about our business of building up our national defenses without first developing an acute case of jitters.

About the only new and unforeseen factors in the present European war that have developed since the declaration of war are the factors of its speed and ferocity. Twenty years of peace have caused many of us to either forget or fail to realize the horror of war. The business and obligation of Government officials in high positions is to guard and protect the Nation against great danger. One of our greatest dangers always is that of failing to realize impending disaster in time to prepare calmly, efficiently, and adequately to meet it before it is upon us. For that reason, when I came to the special session of Congress last September I was hopeful that

the committee on which I am serving might examine and determine the status of our national defenses at once. The lack of adequate defense was quite obvious. With war flaming in Europe, I spoke here in the House on November 1 emphasizing as strongly as I could that America was not prepared for a war of any kind.

Notwithstanding the situation that then existed and notwithstanding the fact that we literally sat here for weeks awaiting action on the embargo bill by the Senate, ready and willing to devote our time and study to problems of national defense, the Military Affairs Committee was not called into session once throughout the entire special session of Congress. Much valuable time was literally wasted. Even though our own defenses are obviously inadequate and even though nothing was done about it by our committee during the special session, on March 27 there was brought before the committee the proposal of the administration to sell our latest aircraft to the Allies. At that time I made a special point to ask representatives of the War Department and General Staff whether our pilot-training program was progressing satisfactorily. When told that it was, I then asked whether it was the pilot-training program that had been presented to our committee more than a year ago, or whether it was some new pilot-training program. It turned out to be the program of more than 1 year ago.

We were literally snoozing through many months of precious time. Then came May 16 and the awakening—an awakening to our needs for 1942? No, an awakening to our needs for the immediate present, the supply of which cannot possibly be brought into existence for many months ahead.

But that is not the whole story; instead of receiving a request from the administration to go about the business of building up our defenses quietly, efficiently, and economically, we have had the spotlight of great drama played upon the inauguration of our efforts which must of necessity be long drawn out and time-consuming. On May 16 not only our Nation but the entire world was told in most dramatic fashion that America has just awakened to the need of adequate national defense.

From a total number of serviceable Army planes, obsolete, obsolescent, and what-have-you, in the number of 2,700, we were told and the world was told that we must at once build to a productive capacity of 50,000 planes per year. We have been told by the military experts of the Nation of the need for a protective mobilization plan calling for a force of 1,000,000 men, and we have been told that it will take 1½ years to 3 years time to supply the various critical and essential items for a force of that size after appropriations therefor have been made available.

We are now told that we will need to complete training of 7,000 pilots per year, and yet under our new program we cannot train more than 4,500 by February 1942. While recent events in Europe have emphasized the importance of aircraft in war, it seems to me that the need for augmentation of our entire defense program, including aircraft, was so obvious on the day the special session convened last September, that the Committee on Military Affairs should have functioned very energetically but quietly throughout the entire special session of Congress, and most certainly it seems that after so much delay in looking to our defenses, our plight is not helped by drama, world-wide radio hook-ups, and screaming headlines.

We have been told that to make the same request last September would have been war-mongering, but I submit that the only war-mongering involved is the method in which the matter has been played up to the public. The quiet, orderly, and efficient development of our national defenses could and should be an aid to peace.

One point of great importance that should be emphasized at this time is the inconsistency of selling our latest and best equipment abroad at the very time that we need it most to train our own flyers. Testimony before the committee revealed that only about 3,000 of our aviators today are trained to fly the latest planes and testimony also showed that it requires approximately 8 to 9 months' training beyond

the regular primary, basic, and advanced flying course to develop a pilot capable of flying the latest and fastest planes.

We cannot call our preparations adequate if our pilots are not adequately trained to fly the latest planes.

The production capacity of our airplane factories is only one part of adequate defense preparation in aircraft. I know that our Army officials will make maximum use of every facility made available to them for adequate training, but it seems to me a very grave error to divest ourselves of our fastest and best planes so badly needed for training purposes. I only hope the administration will make available to the Army enough of these newest planes to enable the Army to carry out a complete training program.

In closing, I wish to add that I am greatly disturbed by the vast amount of screaming headlines and radio broadcasts with reference to our defense preparations. Let me emphasize again that the building of adequate defenses is or should be a sincere move for peace and that there is nothing in this bill that will or should lead us to war unless we build an uncontrollable hysteria through thoughtless ballyhoo and drama. Is it not possible for us to proceed with the building of our defenses quietly? Why is it necessary to make so much noise about our plans at this time? Judging from my mail here, people are wholeheartedly in favor of any reasonable strengthening of our defenses, and they do not need to be sold on that point. The people of my district have been urging adequate defense preparation ever since the present European war started. What they fear is that we may be drawn into that war, and the excitement whipped up here in Washington has not allayed and will not allay that fear. President Roosevelt has scheduled another fireside chat and he has a great opportunity to allay the fears of our people. Let us hope he sets himself diligently to the task of taking the fire out of his next fireside chat. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, without hysteria, very calmly, the Congress is voting for this measure. We are all intensely patriotic, but I want to warn the Democratic Party that the Republicans do not give up any of their rights. You have not annexed us. I realize the pleasure that some of you gentlemen on the Democratic side have in reading into type of this bill, "A bill for national defense and to make the Nation safe for the Democratic Party." I say that with all the pleasantness that I can assume, because if your present leader sees fit to be a candidate for office, he must enter the lists, as anyone may enter them. Certainly we are patriotic. I congratulate you gentlemen on the Democratic side on one phase of it, and that is that you are able to cover up \$20,000,000,000 of expenditure under the story that you had to do it for defense. You think the public will forget it. We are not going to let the public forget. I am amused that you have written into this bill that all these expenditures must be kept careful account of and a report in respect to them made to the next Congress. It is highly amusing to read that. We are certainly going to have an accounting, so that my chief message and one message is, that we are as patriotic as you gentlemen on the other side, and that you have not annexed us. We are still a militant Republican Party, and you may have a Chamberlain after all amongst you, for things do not always go as they should. I reserve all rights on these questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill to expedite the strengthening of the national defense has been reported to the House by the Committee on Military Affairs in response to President Roosevelt's message, which he delivered to a joint session of the Congress last week.

I congratulate that committee upon the speed and promptness with which they have reported this measure to the House, which, in my judgment, is vitally important and necessary

to our national defense for the reasons set forth in the able address of our great President. As was so well said by him:

These are ominous days—days whose swift and shocking developments force every neutral nation to look to its defenses in the light of new factors. The brutal force of modern offensive war has been loosed in all its horror. New powers of destruction, incredibly swift and deadly, have been developed, and those who wield them are ruthless and daring. No old defense is so strong that it requires no further strengthening, and no attack is so unlikely or impossible that it may be ignored.

Let us examine, without self-deception, the dangers which confront us. Let us measure our strength and our defense without self-delusion.

The clear fact is that the American people must recast their thinking about national protection.

Surely the developments of the past few weeks have made it clear to all of our citizens that the possibility of attack on vital American zones ought to make it essential that we have the physical, the ready ability to meet those attacks and to prevent them from reaching their objectives.

This means military implements—not on paper—which are ready and available to meet any lightning offensive against our American interest. It means also that facilities for production must be ready to turn out munitions and equipment at top speed.

We have had the lesson before us over and over again—nations that were not ready and were unable to get ready found themselves overrun by the enemy.

The European war has broken forth in all its fury. Within the past few weeks Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium, all peaceful and neutral nations which were maintaining strict neutrality and taking no part whatever in that conflict, have been invaded and desecrated, and there has been ruthless destruction of the lives of their citizens and their homes by a cruel and despotic ruler, whose conscience knows no bounds save that of self-interest and self-glory.

The rapidity of the movements of his army and weapons of destruction have demonstrated that no country is safe from invasion or attack and that world conquest is his goal. The ruthless destruction of life and property by him and his army menaces not only the democracies and governments of Europe but those in all parts of the world. A world conflagration is now raging, and America cannot sit supinely by without looking to its own defense and its own preservation. A calm and judicial consideration of existing conditions makes it imperative that we prepare, and prepare immediately, to repel any aggressions or any invasions of our rights as a people or as a nation, and also to repel any invasion of the rights of the 21 American Republics, of which we are an integral part.

If the Monroe Doctrine is essential to our preservation, and I believe that it is, we must be adequately prepared on land and sea and air to maintain its integrity and the integrity of the 21 American Republics with which we are associated and the invasion of whose liberty and of whose sovereignty menaces our own safety and existence.

The technique of war and conditions in Europe have changed with such lightning rapidity that what might have been considered adequate defense a year or even a few months ago is no longer sufficient, and it behooves us, as a matter of ordinary prudence, to see that our country is equipped with sufficient mechanized weapons of war and an aerial fleet so large and a navy so powerful that no nation and no dictator will dare commit any act of aggression against us.

The preparedness which we must now undertake is not for the purpose of war but for the preservation of peace. I am not an alarmist, but I hope that I am a realist, and no thoughtful individual, however peacefully inclined he may be, or however strong his convictions may be against war, as are my own, could for one moment hesitate to pass legislation and appropriate funds sufficient in the judgment of our military experts in this critical period through which we are now passing.

In the grave crisis which now exists, threatening democracy and civilization and our own security and safety, I shall wholeheartedly support this bill and hope for its unanimous passage by the Members of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said during the course of this debate today about different phases

of national defense. We have received lots of figures and lots of facts which we can use and digest at a later date and appreciate the manner in which they have been rendered. In the short time allotted to me, I want to call the committee back to the principles of the bill itself and, in the few moments that I have, I shall relate some of the powers granted under the express stipulations of the bill.

This bill is entitled "A Bill to Expedite the Strengthening of the National Defense," and I think it is most properly named. This bill, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, "takes off the lid" on restrictions covering necessary action for national defense. It goes the whole way toward giving the Army full authority to place its organization in perfect shape to meet any danger which may threaten this country. At this time in the affairs of this Nation, I think it very proper that we give the Army unusual authority so that it may speed up every preparation and every phase of our national-defense program.

More particularly, Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the fact that within the time limits specified in this bill the Secretary of War is given full authority to provide necessary construction, rehabilitation, and installations at military posts, depot stations, and other localities throughout the United States. It gives full authority for the Secretary of War to acquire land for the manufacturing, maintenance, and storage of military equipment, munitions, and supplies.

In reference to the Air Service, especially, the powers given under this bill are vitally important. Eight thousand five hundred flying cadets may be enlisted annually, and an average of 6,000 Reserve Air Corps may be ordered to extended active duty upon the orders of the War Department declaring a necessity for this action. The number of airplanes which in prior legislation was restricted to 6,000 planes is now set without limit save the amount of money which Congress may be able to appropriate for this purpose. If any intent is understood in this legislation, it is the intent of Congress that the air force be immediately built up to a surpassing strength.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. I know the gentleman is quite familiar with this subject, and I would like to ask what our production capacity is at the present time?

Mr. BROOKS. The testimony shows that the production capacity of airplanes in the United States at the present time is 14,000. It is hoped to build this up to 50,000 airplanes per year in the future.

I believe the authority contained in this act is ample, but should further authority be required for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of our air force and making it large enough to fully protect our shores from all hostile invasion, I feel sure that Congress will go as far as is fully necessary to accomplish this purpose. The people of the United States are fully aware of the importance of the air service and want, regardless of cost, a force adequate to meet the full needs of the present hour.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. TERRY. Is there anything contemplated in reference to the liberalizing of regulations in regard to the commissioning of Reserve officers in the Regular Army? As it is now, when Reserve officers reach the age of 28 or 29 they are not permitted to take regular commissions. In other words, they have to train these boys who go into the Regular Army, and they cannot go in themselves. Is there any liberalizing in that regard?

Mr. BROOKS. There is nothing in this bill to liberalize it, but the testimony showed that the War Department was interested in further liberalizing the provisions of the law and regulations, so that 6,000 Reserve officers could be inducted into the service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is there any provision for increasing the number assigned to the C. M. T. C.?

Mr. BROOKS. No provision in this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a most valuable service.

Mr. BROOKS. It is a most valuable service and very essential.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. I am very much interested to note on page 2 of the bill, where it reads "except that the average number of flying cadets shall not exceed 8,500." I do not believe the limitation should be placed in this bill. It should be left in the discretion of the Army.

Mr. BROOKS. I will say to my colleague from Louisiana that the testimony of the officials of the War Department showed it is expected that during the current year 6,000 such cadets might be trained and brought into service. The limit, however, is set at 8,500 under this bill, which everyone felt was the utmost which the War Department would require during the year 1941.

Now, to continue:

This bill goes further and permits the President to shift the enlisted men from one branch of the service to another. In other words, should it be found that more men are needed in the Artillery, by Executive order a rearrangement of our forces is permitted. The Secretary of War is authorized to waive the requirements of civil service wherever necessary so that men may be available without regard to red tape or delays or present law at once. The whole intent is that our national-defense preparation should be quickened and expedited to the utmost. One of the most interesting and yet not unusual phases of this legislation is the appropriation of \$132,000,000 which is given the President of the United States for expenditure. Broad and comprehensive authority is given under the terms of this act for the President to use this vast sum of money for any purpose presently authorized under existing law for the furnishing of Government-owned facilities and privately owned plants or procurement and training of civilian personnel necessary in the expediting of our national defense and for the procurement of strategic and critical materials demanded by this Nation in time of emergency. Similar materials were made available to the Army of the United States in the last war, and they should be made available to the Nation in the existing emergency. In a few weeks this Congress will adjourn and its Members will go home. This money will be available for use to meet the needs not presently seen by us today and will guarantee that our program of national defense will proceed without interruption from unforeseen requirements and expenditures. After the present emergency shall have passed, of course, an accounting will be made of the expenditure from these funds to the Congress.

America is fully aroused today to the need of national defense. The invasion of numerous unoffending little neutral countries by Germany within recent months has alarmed us to the point that our people demand full preparation for defense. The cruel and barbarous methods used in the present so-called civilized warfare have made us realize more than ever the full import of this tragic hour in the world history. The fearful and devastating effect of the German air service against fortifications, troops, and civilians has brought a demand from our people that we have an air force second to none in the world.

A sleeping giant has awakened. The American people are now fully alive to the necessity of this preparation to protect ourselves and our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. They demand, and this Congress will give, full protection for all defensive purposes. This bill takes the lid off of restrictions and gives the Secretary of War that latitude and authority which I think, in the present world crisis, he is entitled to have to accomplish his task. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this bill.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, this bill to expedite the strengthening of our national defense has my wholehearted support. It contains certain authorizations which are clearly necessary. It removes or suspends certain limitations now prescribed by law and the necessities of the present situation clearly require their removal. It provides the President with a discretionary fund of \$132,000,000 to enable him to deal adequately with unforeseen situations which may arise. I have heard criticism of this last item on the ground that at various times in the past discretionary funds placed at the President's disposal for various purposes have been improperly used. Without going into the merits or demerits of what has happened in the past, let me say that this fund is clearly necessary in the present emergency and I cannot conceive that it will not be properly used under present conditions. Even if it were a larger sum, I would still vote to place it at the President's disposal.

This bill will be coupled with a somewhat similar bill for the Navy. Both these bills will be supplemented by various appropriation bills for the various branches of our Military and Naval Establishments. These bills provide for carrying into effect a program which should eventually, coupled with future appropriations, enable us to defend ourselves adequately against world conditions which may occur. However, mere voting of authorizations and appropriations by Congress does not solve the problem. It only furnishes to the Chief Executive, who is the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, the power and the money with which to get what is needed. His is the duty and responsibility of translating into the latest and most modern equipment and machinery these dollars given to him by Congress.

No one in any army in any battle of the present war to date has been killed or seriously injured by having a dollar, a franc, a mark, or a lira thrown at him or shot at him. It is only when these dollars, francs, marks, and lira are converted into instruments of warfare that they become useful in defense. The degree to which they are useful depends in great measure upon the extent to which they are adapted to the nature of the warfare of today and to the warfare of tomorrow.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR BEING PREPARED—PAST AND FUTURE

Events of recent weeks across the Atlantic have brought home to us all too clearly that this country is not now prepared. There is nothing to be gained from criticizing what has happened. Crying over spilt milk never puts the milk back in the pail. But it is essential to recognize where the present responsibility lies so that from this time forward we can demand results and sure results. Congress has supplied, is supplying, and will supply the means. Our national integrity and our national existence demand that we get the correct solution to the problem of national defense at once.

The present administration has control of every department in the executive branch of the Government. It controls the Senate of the United States. It controls the House of Representatives. Members of the House and Senate who pledge allegiance to the present administration predominate on every committee in both the House and Senate, including the Military Affairs Committees and the Naval Affairs Committees. Instances where House or Senate committees during the past 7 years have reported favorably major bills of any kind not sponsored by the Chief Executive and his advisers are few and far between. Responsibility for our present lack of preparedness is clear and fixed. It rests upon the present administration. The fact that this state of unpreparedness exists is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that the President and the State Department predicted months ago with such remarkable accuracy the course of history which has lately been unfolded in all its grim reality before our eyes. How could they foretell the future, yet not prepare to meet it? Perhaps these past errors may to a certain extent be shifted. Perhaps members of the minority party should have shouted more loudly, though they clearly did not have at their disposal all the manifold items of information gleaned by the State Department, the War Department, and the various branches of the Government. Perhaps the public, lulled by

years of peace and disarmament, with its attention continually focused upon new reform measures and upon attaining a more abundant life, was apathetic and not interested in national defense. But why was it not brought forcibly to their attention? We all want social security for our citizens. But why was not the attention of our citizens called to the fact that underlying all plans for social security which we Americans might gain as Americans, was the absolute essential of national security? For no nation can provide security of any kind for its citizens unless it is prepared to defend its integrity as a nation against aggression.

Let responsibility for the past fall where it may, responsibility for the future rests clearly upon the Executive. Congress, with the true nonpartisan spirit which characterizes the American people in time of stress, will vote what is needed. Republicans to a man will join with Democrats in voting for this bill. I for one expect results and will hold those who have the duty of carrying into effect these means we now provide to a strict accountability as far as results in the future are concerned. I do not intend to criticize unduly, but I do intend to reserve a critical judgment. Let us all have faith, but let it not be a blind and unquestioning faith. Let it be a faith founded upon a critical judgment that those steps which are necessary are being quickly and intelligently taken.

Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to any great knowledge of military affairs, although I have given it considerable thought. I have, however, been a consistent reader for many years of the news of the world, more particularly so in recent months since my election to the Congress. Certain facts of history, past and present, stand out in my mind very strongly. From these facts I draw certain conclusions. With all due deference to the many who know more about these matters than I do, I feel it my duty to submit these facts and my conclusions to the members of the committee. I do this not with the idea of submitting any new or striking idea, but with the purpose of emphasizing a thought of great importance.

LESSONS WE HAVE JUST LEARNED

After the first World War—I can never use the word “first” with World War without a feeling of shock and horror that it should be necessary to make such a distinction—well, after the first World War the theory became prevalent that warfare had reached the stage where it was “static.” War operations would cover only a relatively small area. The chances of successful attack upon strong defensive fortifications would be very small, people said, and could only possibly be successful at great cost. France and Great Britain relied upon the Maginot line, the Belgian fortifications, and upon the British Fleet, which, through its command of the sea, would be able to starve into submission potential foes by cutting off their sources of supply and raw materials. Recent events have caused many to doubt whether this strategy was completely sound. The need for constant improvement was to some degree neglected. Through the development of new instruments for warfare on land, on sea, and in the air, Hitler has won some important advances and has shown that warfare is not “static” but can cover wider areas than anyone ever imagined in his wildest dreams. How was Hitler able to accomplish these military maneuvers and upset these previous judgments of so many outstanding military experts? Today the explanation is quite clear. For 7 years Hitler and his underlings have been devoting almost the entire energy and the entire resources of the German Nation to producing wartime goods and a wartime economy. Hitler commanded the inventors, the scientists, the research facilities of the nation and forced them to devote their time, their brains, their ingenuity to producing equipment which would revolutionize the technique of modern warfare.

As we study the history of the wars of the past, it becomes very clear that we cannot predict the technique or nature of the wars of the future, more particularly of some war waged by some aggressor against us. The two oceans still render our position unique and peculiar, say what you will. As the horrors of the war in Europe become more evident day by day, the importance of the newest and latest in war

machinery becomes more obvious. Men, courage, and training alone suffice no longer. It is my opinion that any sound scheme of national defense must provide the American forces with equipment superior to—not merely equal to—any in the world. In that way we not only ensure their success but we keep their casualties, in the event an encounter might take place, to a minimum. In that way we gain freedom from attack and can achieve peace.

COORDINATION OF ALL OUR RESOURCES IN SCIENCE AND RESEARCH IS NECESSARY AT ONCE—WE MUST LEAD, NOT FOLLOW

The United States of America has always been a land of inventors. The United States for years has led the world in science and invention. An American invented the locomotive, the armored warship, and the airplane. The bulk of our inventive genius and research, however, has always been devoted to finding those things of use to mankind and which would add comfort, health, and happiness to the people of the world. That was surely fitting, wise, and proper. We wish they could continue to devote their time to these pursuits. Only incidentally of recent years have our inventors and researchers found substances or improvements valuable to war and destruction. When found, they are made available to our Military Establishments. Such discoveries generally are incidental and accidental, found while conducting investigations calculated to solve some peacetime problem. True, we have such departments in our Army, where specialists continually strive for improvement in equipment specifically for military purposes. But these departments represent only a small fraction of the total talent along these lines available in the Nation as a whole. These departments today must be frightfully undermanned and overworked trying to keep track of what is new in Europe.

I wish all our peacetime students and workers in the fields of science, chemistry, and mechanics could continue to devote their energies to peacetime pursuits. In this time of need, however, it seems to me that some, at least, should be called upon to give their time and study to the problem of designing and inventing superior matériel for the United States in relation to the peculiar and specific needs of our own defense problem. What may be best in Europe is not at all necessarily what would be best adapted for us here. Our special situation requires special and intensive study. It seems to me that the primary move in this whole defense program should be to coordinate the best of this abundance of talent along these lines which we have here with our Army and Navy men. This should not be difficult to do. Our chiefs of staff and their technical aides know the problems. They could present them for solution. Few men would refuse such a call from the Government. Few industries would refuse to loan their best men for at least a limited time for such a purpose. Few industries would refuse to make their laboratories available for such a purpose. The problem of providing necessary facilities for them by the Government should be fairly simple and relatively inexpensive.

Right now the President is stressing production and productive capacity. Far be it from me to underestimate the importance of productive capacity. More important and more fundamental than even productive capacity is the proper determination of what we are to produce. It is of little benefit to produce something that is obsolete. It is almost equally futile to use productive capacity to turn out something good when we could use those same facilities for turning out something much better.

It seems to me this step should have been taken weeks ago. It seems to me this should have been started even before a defense message was sent to Congress. As I have stated before, it is nothing new or original. Out of a basically similar idea during the World War came the Liberty motor. The Liberty motor was created right down here in the Willard Hotel in Washington by the joint knowledge and study of a few men gathered together for that very purpose. This whole idea is devastatingly important. In this world in which force and aggression are becoming increasingly prevalent and are covering wider and wider areas, we must

have the strength to repel any aggressor. Fortunately, if we have that strength, it is unlikely that any aggressor will dare to attack us. By such means, we will be able to preserve our national integrity and at the same time preserve our peace.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, back of any divergence of our many varied opinions, and beneath the little eccentricities of individual character, there is great fundamental unity of the interests and purposes of mankind. Fortunately for the American people, whenever we have faced a grave crisis we have been capable of placing the welfare of the country above our own personal, individual, and political fortunes.

I think we all realize that a house divided against itself cannot stand; that united we stand and divided we fall; and that unless we all hang together we are going to hang separately.

It is now almost a quarter of a century ago when the Democratic Party went before the American people in one of its annual campaigns, or quadrennial campaigns, urging its reelection upon the simple and plain slogan that it kept us out of war. There were enough Republicans in this country who loved peace—because there is no difference between Republicans and Democrats when it comes to peace and war; the American people universally love peace and hate war—there were enough Republicans in our Nation to join with our Democratic brethren in returning the present administration at that time, which was Democratic, to office, and yet after being returned to power upon that solemn pledge and sacred covenant, within 1 month's time after the second inauguration of Mr. Wilson this Nation found itself actually engaged in hostilities. All the good intentions and rosy promises did not save us from war. Indeed, it was known at the time the promises were made to keep us out that we soon would likely be in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I cannot yield. I am sorry.

At that time Republicans in Congress and Republicans out of Congress adjourned politics. We marched side by side with our Democratic brethren not as Republicans and Democrats, but as Americans; not as partisans, but as patriots; and ever since the close of that world catastrophe, Republicans and Democrats have supported various defense measures. The present bill before us was unanimously reported by our Committee on Military Affairs and no doubt will be supported by Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. Chairman, we are now confronted with another great crisis. This is no hour for hysteria. If ever the American people needed to remain cool and calm, that time is now. We should exercise deliberate and well-balanced judgment and be perfectly willing to face the hard, cold, and cruel facts, unpleasant as those facts might be. Wishful thinking will not reach our goal, nor will excessive flag waving achieve permanent results. We do need, however, a rebirth of good old-fashioned patriotism and learn once more to love our country as our home. Let no one underestimate the gravity of the situation or the strength of the forces of might that have been let loose in the world.

Since the close of the World War in 1918 it is easy now to see that both Britain and France went to sleep at the switch. America likewise has been too apathetic and indifferent to the question of adequate preparedness or defense; we, too, have been sleeping. I would not place all the blame for our pitiful unpreparedness in this tragic hour upon the man who is now in the White House. All Members of Congress, and even members of the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs, perhaps have been somewhat derelict in the performance of their duty. But I think it cannot be denied that the great rearmament program that has been going on in Europe was not started until 1933 when the present Fuehrer took over the reins of the Government of Germany.

And, strange as it may seem, simultaneously in that year the present occupant in the White House took over the reins of our American Government. The lamentable fact, the tragic fact is that after being in complete control of this country with an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Congress, after being voted extraordinary and excessive powers not granted even by the Constitution, after being handed over blank checks running into the billions upon billions of dollars which he and his advisers could spend at any time and in any manner they chose without any brakes upon it or earmarks attached to it, the United States finds itself today after the new dealers have spent \$66,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money since the 5th of March 1933—more money than has been spent by all the Presidents and all the Congresses and administrations from the adoption of the Constitution in old Philadelphia down to and including the World War—after Mr. Roosevelt who has had almost absolute power over the economic destiny of a mighty and a free people, after these unexampled and unparalleled expenditures we find ourselves in a state of woeful unpreparedness.

If we have responsible government in this country, where are we going to place the blame and responsibility for our present tragic plight? I believe in pouring the oil where the squeak is, and the squeak is in this administration, that has wasted our substance upon foolish and futile projects of no consequence and of no permanent value, and has been so busily engaged in keeping itself continued in office that it has not had time to pay much attention to the defenses of this great Nation. [Applause.] After all, Mr. Chairman, we live in a Republic. Ours is a constitutional, representative democracy, a government under a two-party system. We must continue this two-party system if we would preserve our freedom. It is not only the sacred and inherent right, but it is likewise the constitutional and solemn duty of the minority party to criticize and hold in check the party that happens to be in power. Let no man charge his colleague on the floor of this House with being unpatriotic when he dare rise to his feet and speak out of the patriotism of his soul and the deepest recesses of his heart what he at least sincerely and honestly believes to be for the good and the welfare of his country.

Oh, it is nice to say that we should forget party and politics. It makes all the difference in the world, though, whose ox is gored. I was pleased to listen to my good friend—and he is my personal friend—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] when he admonished us that we perhaps should sit idly by and not question either the ability or the efficiency, whether or not we should dare question the motive or purposes, of certain men now in high places.

I would like very much to recommend the remarks he made on this floor today to his distinguished colleague, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], who in the RECORD of May 22, page 6663—only 2 or 3 days ago—when pleading for the Members of this House to vote \$500,000 to furnish a press-clipping bureau to this administration to use in the coming election, had this to say to his Republican brethren over here. I quote the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. He said:

In the months to come they (Republicans) are going to find out that that glimmer of hope that they had after the election of 1938, when they had such an overwhelming victory that they left a majority of only 92 Democrats in the House—that small glimmer of hope which they had then is not flaming quite so brightly as it was a few months ago.

[Applause.]

You know, of course, a war diverts our attention from domestic failures. But surely no one would invite a war to win an election.

And it will continue—

The gentleman from Texas said—

to flicker and flicker, and perhaps instead of carrying 46 States of the Union in November 1940 it will have then flickered out, and the vote for the Democrats will be unanimous.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, that is the galling example of the spirit of unity that has been asked of us here. [Applause.] That is the cooperation we receive from our Democratic brethren. Their conception of unity is complete subservience of all Republicans. If we are so docile and submissive as to accept all orders from their chief in the White House, then our cowardice and gullibility will be accepted as complete unity and absolute harmony. The majority's idea of cooperation is total capitulation of the minority.

Already a blitzkrieg has been declared against us, and our opponents are giving us a practical training course in the art of Trojan-horse and "fifth column" activity. Both our candidate for the Presidency 4 years ago, Mr. Landon, and our candidate for the Vice Presidency at the same time, Colonel Knox, have been invited to the White House, and we are told have been offered positions in a coalition Cabinet. In church circles they call that proselyting, but in politics I suppose you would call it a clever but not too subtle attempt to immobilize the Republican Party and sabotage all opposition. We shall not be seduced by such wily wooing even in critical times. It would seem that those now in power are so anxious for unity that they are willing to set up a one-party government in this country. That is exactly what they have in Germany, Italy, and Russia today. And God knows we do not want it here.

While I am not as old as some men on this floor, I recall that in 1918, when the Republicans had adjourned their politics and forgot all about party, when Republicans were marching and fighting by the side of the Democrats and willing to die if need be, Mr. Wilson asked the American people to give him a Democratic House. Instead he got not only a Republican House but a Republican Senate as well in 1918. [Applause.] So there is a possibility—the rare possibility—that history might repeat itself. [Laughter.]

The beloved majority leader spoke about the election of 1938. I would like to say to him and to all my Democratic colleagues that we did not have an election in 1938—not in Missouri. We had a public sale—that is what we had. [Laughter and applause.] They tripled the number on W. P. A. 3 weeks before the election in my district and cut them all off the pay rolls 3 days after the election was over, and they tried to sandbag the gentleman from Pennsylvania, CHARLIE FADDIS, the same as they did me, but could not do it. This administration would purge a Democrat just as quickly as it would a Republican—anyone who dares to differ with the New Deal is marked for slaughter. How, after the memorable court-packing fight in the Senate, anyone could question the truth or the accuracy of this statement is more than I can understand.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I cannot yield, although I hate to miss the pearls of wisdom of the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, modern warfare is a highly complex, technical, and specialized activity. Of course, my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] is absolutely right when he says our hindsight is better than our foresight, which goes to prove that after all a man is not so different from a lightning bug that has a headlight on his rear end. [Laughter.] Always we can realize our mistakes much better after they are committed than before we make them. Though we have a splendid brigade in our Army, that is just part of one division; and although I have supreme confidence in the present Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall—and one of the best things the President ever did was to appoint him—anyone who has heard the hearings and talked to these Army men cannot but realize that in the present hour our defense is woefully and pitifully inadequate. We need more aircraft; we need more anti-aircraft guns; we need more tanks; we need more antitank guns; more artillery, coast and field apparatus, heavy and light; we need more rifles, particularly the Garand type of semiautomatic rifle; we need more ammunition, as well as vital and strategic matériel. We have in this country only enough manganese that is essential in the production of steel to last us for 1 year. We have only enough tin and

rubber in continental United States to supply our domestic needs in times of peace for 2 or 3 months. Where in the name of God has the Commander in Chief of the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the United States been all these past 7 years? [Applause.]

Who is responsible for this failure? Had we been in power, does anyone think for a moment—is he so naive or so gullible as not to believe that we would have a dozen men on the Democratic side standing in their places and laying the responsibility exactly where it would belong—upon the party that is actually in power?

Well, I do not know what is ahead, and you do not either. I fear the hill will be steep and the road rough, but I still, even yet, have faith in the American people to meet any exigency.

Mr. PATRICK. Cannot the gentleman yield for a second?

Mr. SHORT. No.

Mr. Chairman, the United States and all its citizens, wherever they are, will perhaps have to accept a little lower standard of living than we have had in the past. They are going to have to sacrifice a little and give up here and give up there. Self-denial must be practiced. Rigorous training and severe discipline are essential. Personally, I am willing to vote for a tax bill at this session to pay these increased expenditures. [Applause.] Congress must have courage if we expect our people to have it.

Yesterday, as usual, I was 1 of 21 who voted against the so-called relief bill appropriating \$1,100,000,000. Of course, that perhaps will take care of many people at election time in a boondoggling, pump-priming fashion. It has utterly failed to restore sound prosperity. After we have been taken for this buggy ride on a merry-go-round for 7 years we get off where we started, with our national debt doubled, with 10,000,000 men out of work, and with the moral fiber of our citizens weakened.

There is one thing the President said in his speech a week ago yesterday that I liked. He said in effect we need to toughen our hides. Would that he had made that discovery sooner. America's greatest weakness at this moment is her internal bickering and moral disintegration. We need guns, we need ammunition, we need matériel; but it takes more than airplanes and tanks and ships to win a war. We have to harden the sinews of our people. In the past 7 years this patronizing, paternalistic Government, instead of strengthening the spirit and increasing the morale of the American people, has undermined it until we are threatened with destruction. We are producing a race of softies. This group says give me this. This other group says give me that. The American people are suffering from the "gimmies," and it will require the united will and purposes of a mighty, free people if we are ever able to defend ourselves or make ourselves worthy of this noble heritage of freedom that has been bequeathed to us. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I trust that everybody is trying to keep us out of war and wants to stay out. It is not what a man's motives alone or what his purposes are that count. It is what the result of his action will be.

In concluding, I want to say that the President of the United States has done certain undeniable things as shown by incontrovertible facts. You can draw your own conclusions. Twenty years ago he was Democratic nominee for the Vice Presidency in the 1920 campaign when the only issue was the League of Nations. The question then was whether we should get into the League of Nations or stay out. Franklin D. Roosevelt went from one end of this country to the other to get us in. Mr. Roosevelt was an internationalist in 1920. In 1935, 2 years after he went to the White House, he brought all the powers of the Presidency to bear upon the Senate to get us into the same League of Nations through the back door of the World Court, and would have succeeded had it not been for the combined and arduous efforts of the Senator from California [HIRAM W. JOHNSON] and the late lamented Senator William Edgar Borah from Idaho.

Three years ago the President of the United States dedicated a bridge in Chicago and spoke about quarantining aggressor

nations and subjecting them to certain economic sanctions. That was directed at a particular country in the Orient. About 2 years ago Anthony Eden, a suave British salesman, was royally entertained by our diplomats in Washington, and then a year ago last January the President called his Ambassadors to Great Britain and France, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Bullitt, back to the United States to appear before our combined Committees on Military Affairs sitting in executive session. The Senate committee visited him at the White House and the President is reported to have said that our frontier is on the Rhine. This the President denied, but certain Senators said that the President made that statement. I do not know whether he did or not. However, in an airplane crash in California a French pilot was injured shortly afterward and for the first time we learned of the secret sales of airplanes by this Nation to the Allies.

Not only that, but to top it all off, the King and Queen themselves came over. We extended them the courtesy we would any foreign monarch. But is it not strange that for the first time in the history of our Republic a British monarch set foot upon American soil? We all put on our bib and tucker and went and shook hands with King George and Queen Elizabeth here under the dome of the Capitol. They were wined and dined at the White House and ate hot dogs up at Hyde Park. I do not know what the conversation was between the President and the King. I would like to know just exactly what was said. I know that on that day we never had as many British people or as many British flags in Washington since they burned this Capitol in 1812. [Laughter.]

As everyone knows, it was not long after Their Majesties' return home that Great Britain was in war with Germany. President Roosevelt declared a limited emergency and called the Congress of the United States into special session to lift the embargo on arms to belligerents on the cash-and-carry basis. When the Congress met at the beginning of this session the President again told us with considerable emphasis that we were to employ methods stronger than words, but short of war, in defense of certain ideologies. More recently he declared that America's mission was to defend our western culture and our Christian civilization. If this world mission is ours, then perhaps we are already in this war and do not know it.

Regardless of what our inherent and inherited sympathies are or how much we might favor a particular belligerent, our first duty is to the United States and to our own citizens.

No country ever entered a conflict out of higher idealism, with more unselfish purposes, or more noble motives than the United States did in 1917. Without pride of power, lust of ambition, or desire for imperial dominion, we entered the World War for two specific reasons: First, to make the world safe for democracy, and, second, to end war itself.

Today our soldiers and our people are bitterly disillusioned because we failed to achieve either objective. We got 2,000,000 men to France, spilled our blood, and spent our treasure, but came out of the conflict without an acre of territory and without a dollar's indemnity. We asked for nothing and got exactly what we asked for.

No, Mr. Chairman, we did get something. We got 10 years of depression, 10,000,000 men out of work, \$13,000,000,000 of bad war debts which we will never collect—most of the money loaned to our Allies after the armistice was signed and after hostility ceased—and 4 cemeteries in France. The only thing we could get out of another conflict would be deeper debts, higher taxes, and more graveyards. It is obvious to our military experts, if not to our laymen, that America, by entering the war at this late date, would be of little aid to Britain and France. Should we become involved and spend our strength, then we will be weak when the conflict is over. If, however, we stay out of the war and put our own house in order, we perhaps can be in a position to help bind up the world's wounds and to give some encouragement and assistance to a bruised, broken, and bleeding world.

Our first line of defense is our own financial solvency and moral integrity. And the hour has struck when we should put our own fiscal affairs upon a sound basis. We could go into

the last war with a debt of \$1,000,000,000 hanging over us, but when we have now practically reached the constitutional debt limit of \$45,000,000,000, not counting several additional billions in contingent liabilities which Uncle Sam has underwritten or guaranteed, we should hesitate before entering upon such a costly and destructive enterprise as a war. Hard sense must keep emotion under control, and we should first pay for the last war before getting in another one.

Mr. Chairman, the money we are appropriating today in this bill is not for war but for the prevention of war; it is for defense and not for aggression. It is only a step which, no doubt, will be followed by others to render this country impregnable and invulnerable to successful attack by any foreign power. Never will I vote to send American boys to cross stormy waters to fight for democracy where it is already dead. Rather I prefer to keep them at home instilling patriotism into their breasts and enlisting their efforts in preserving the little democracy we have left on this continent. God help us never to raise up a Hitler here to get rid of one 5,000 miles away.

God, give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, truth faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking.
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions, and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice sleeps.

[Applause, Members rising.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am sure you all appreciate the feelings with which I stand before you, following the very interesting, instructive, and nonpartisan peroration of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. [Laughter and applause.] I am grateful, of course, to the Chairman of this great Committee that he was able to accommodate me in the closing minutes of this debate, because, unlike my distinguished predecessor on this floor, I should like for a few minutes to address myself to the pending bill.

I am proud to state to all that I am heartily in support of this bill to expedite the strengthening of the national defense.

Despite the fate of Poland, Austria, Norway, Holland, and Belgium, and despite the apparent sad fate of a defensive doctrine in France and England, the American people have elected to stand upon the defensive.

It behooves us, therefore, to look well to the instruments of defense.

As one of the representatives of the great city of New York, one of the principal ports of naval construction and refitment on the Atlantic seaboard, I rise, therefore, to invite the attention of this Committee to the pressing need to look to the question of strengthening the coast and harbor defenses of our Nation. I am informed that at no time in 20 years has any comprehensive plan been devised or placed before this House for the modernization of our harbor defenses. I have found no specific request that has been made of the Congress to appropriate funds for this purpose. During the last 3 years only relatively small sums have been requested and these have been so divided between the insular possessions and the Canal that almost nothing has been done for the continental United States.

In my opinion, this problem rests with the General Staff, because coast and harbor defense is traditional with us and it was the duty of the Army to ask that it be maintained. The reason often offered by military authorities for deficiencies in our defense—that Congress will not appropriate the money—is not applicable to this condition, nor is it applicable to our lack of antiaircraft guns. The problem must and, I am hopeful, will be met by the Army.

I wish to point out, moreover, that while I endorse the current program for adequate air defense, that we need, not merely an air force, but a well-balanced, coordinated system of defense, accommodated to the peculiar needs of our own strategy. The strategic problems of America, arising out of its peculiar geography, differ materially from those in Europe today, and it is about the solution of our own problems that we should busy ourselves at once, no matter what happens upon the battlefields of Europe. This we must do immediately, and I, for one, hope that the General Staff of the United States Army, as it is presently constituted, will effectively solve the problems of defense of this country and intelligently spend the money which we have appropriated and will appropriate for this program. This, of course, is no time for amateur strategists to impose their views, but it appears to me that the Army should not, as I know it will not, hesitate to draw upon the vast supply of ability present in this Nation.

In particular, I wish to question the policy of the General Staff which apparently contemplates abandoning the coastal cities of America to any aggressor; against the policy of leaving the industrial cities of New England and the Middle Atlantic States so exposed to attack from the air or sea that the President has suggested that essential industry move into the plains of the Middle West.

I rise to protest against this policy of the General Staff, not only because it might expose to assault large and populous centers, but because it appears to be strategically unsound.

The coast defenses of this country must be improved and strengthened. I am informed that at no place on the Atlantic or Pacific seaboard, the Panama Canal, or in the island outposts of the sea, is there a single turret-mounted coast-defense gun capable of resisting, or protecting, against aerial attack. Apparently all of our coast-defense weapons are exposed in open gun pits; some of the guns are more than 40 years old; many are of the model of 1897.

I hope that under the authority of the pending bill, authorizing as it does,

Such sums as may be necessary * * * to provide * * * for the manufacture, maintenance, and storage of military equipment,

The wisdom of, and necessity for, impregnable coast and harbor defenses will be recognized and the necessary equipment procured.

Up to the present the Army has asked for little money for such coast defenses. The Bureau of Ordnance has apparently designed no new guns. The Chief of Coast Artillery has made no protest, and the best corps of military engineers in the world have been very busy in public works and have constructed and designed no forts for the United States in 40 years.

This condition exists despite the fact that enormous advances have been made in the art of fortification in the past 20 years, notably in the field of turret-mounted land artillery of the character employed in Sweden and along the land fortifications in France.

This state of fact arises, I am informed, largely from the Army's desire for mobility, but it arises in part, too, from the fact that the Coast Artillery Corps, depleted during the last war, is a less attractive service and has never been restored to its former efficiency since 1918.

Every military maneuver in the East for 10 years past has been based upon the assumption that the coast defenses have fallen and that the enemy has moved inland. Upon this assumption, the Army has trained its officers and fought its paper wars.

I doubt the value or wisdom of this strategy.

Let us consider, briefly, what our strategy should be. Essentially, it is a simple one, although the problem arising out of it may be complex in solution. This is a two-ocean country, with a one-ocean Navy. Primarily, our defense lies upon the sea, in the air over the sea, and in the island outposts of the Pacific and the Atlantic. To be victorious in any war, the fleet must be free to pursue an aggressive mission against the enemy. The function of the Army is to protect and de-

fend both coasts of this country, the Panama Canal, and our island outposts in both oceans, so that the fleet may be free to pursue its strategic mission wherever that mission may take it, in either ocean, and then, in security, transit the Canal and bring its full force to bear upon an enemy in either ocean.

To perform this mission, it must have cooperation from the Army. Of course, the Army must train field armies of maneuver capable of getting quickly and effectively anywhere in the North American Continent; but it must also be prepared to defend our coasts and harbors.

In the current discussion, we should remember that no enemy can come upon us in great force except from and over the sea. The recent experience of the British in Norway demonstrates the effectiveness of coastal batteries and that no effective force may land without first seizing adequate ports of entry. This experience further indicates that when adequately defended by coastal batteries, no adequate port can be so seized and that no navy may dare attempt a landing before reducing such fortification. At Trondheim, the British made no attempt to pass the principal forts at the entrance to that harbor and no serious attempt at landing in this country will ever be made if we prepare our batteries well.

The need of our coast defenses today is not merely for modern guns, but for a complete redesign and reconstruction of such fortifications to meet modern military conditions. Included within this is the construction and arming of outlying fortifications, including antiaircraft guns to prevent the attack and investment by any raiding force landed from the sea or air. We need, moreover, an expansion of the regular and militia regiments trained to man and protect these forts; an expansion of our mining forces, and above all, we should have maneuvers to coordinate the work of the land, air, and the sea in such defense.

Under the current system of military instruction, no such coordinated maneuvers have been held for years. Instruction should be given regular infantry and militia officers in the geographical and tactical problems of the defense of our coasts.

It is impossible, in my opinion, to overemphasize the importance of undertaking and completing this work on a great scale at the earliest practicable moment, so that every harbor in this Nation may, in the event of an armed invasion, be effectively closed and entirely interdicted to any enemy.

I do think that our defense does not lie in the air. The essential quality of military planes is mobility and mobility is primarily an attribute of attack rather than defense. Current experience demonstrates that the most effective air patrol is ineffective to ward off attacks.

With respect to antiaircraft guns, the same general observations may be made as in the coast defense. Indeed, antiaircraft is as necessary in such fortifications to resist that type of artillery fire known as aerial bombardment, as are guns to resist fire from the sea.

I well recognize the primary necessity of protecting our lines of communication at Panama and our military and naval bases if we are ever to win a defensive war. The Army must do this and at the same time it must give the strongest defense to our great cities that the American people have the right to expect.

It must also be remembered that New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and the Chesapeake cape cities, as well as the lesser ports of Charleston, S. C., and Portsmouth, N. H., to mention only a few, are all important ports of naval construction, refitment, and supply. It must be remembered that some of those ports give access to the important New England and Middle Atlantic industrial districts, all of which are of great strategic importance, not only to the Navy, but to the Nation.

These ports must have adequate fixed defenses. We have chosen a defensive role in this troubled world, but the defense of such important centers should not be delegated to a mobile army to organize its strategy at the moment of attack, when an enemy—not we—shall choose the time and place to fight. We must be prepared at least to stop him at every important

port in our land, and the Army must perform this task. The providing of such defense belongs to the Army, charged as they are with the duty of securing the safe ingress and egress of the Navy to its bases in narrow waters.

The resultant preservation and strengthening of the civilian morale, so essential in any period of emergency, would be of terrific advantage in the preservation of our national well-being and the happiness and security of our country and its people.

I hope for the maximum protection of my constituency, every important port in the country, and particularly the East, that some measures be promptly taken to reconstitute and reconstruct the coast and harbor defenses of America. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

MUST HAVE ADEQUATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it is always embarrassing to speak on this floor after the silver-tongued orator, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], has delivered one of his masterful and witty addresses. As an orator, entertainer, and Republican spellbinder, he has no equal in either House of the Congress.

It is amusing, however, to hear the distinguished and able gentleman from Missouri plead so eloquently for Democrats to be nonpartisan. [Laughter.] Of all the Members of this House who might not have license to criticize our distinguished floor leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], for what he calls injecting partisanship into debate it is the self-admitted partisan gentleman from Missouri who is said to get up an hour early every morning to hate President Roosevelt and everything that the President is doing and trying to do for the people.

If my good friend from Missouri has ever talked 30 seconds on the floor of this House during either term of the Roosevelt administration without lambasting the President or members of his family, I do not recall it.

Today he criticizes the President because he says 20 years ago Franklin D. Roosevelt was the standard bearer for Vice President when our late beloved President Woodrow Wilson and other Democratic Party leaders, including our then candidate for the Presidency, Governor Cox, advocated the entrance of America into the League of Nations. The gentleman might have further added that had not the Republican leadership, at that time, injected partisan politics into the fight against Woodrow Wilson and in his unselfish and patriotic effort to settle international difficulties at the conference table and by reason rather than at the point of the bayonet, by parachute troops, death bombs, and great devastating tanks, there is every reason to believe that nations would not now be at one another's throats in a death struggle; a terrible war that seems destined to cost the lives of millions of men, untold anguish, misery, and suffering, and heap upon the backs of generations yet unborn billions upon billions of dollars in taxes.

The gentleman from Missouri and other Republican orators today are particularly critical of the President of the United States because they say he has been tardy in calling attention of the Congress to the lack of adequate preparedness on land, water, and in the air. But the gentleman and other unreasonable critics of the President have evidently forgotten his several messages to Congress during the past 8 years, as well as speeches over the radio, in which he has repeatedly called attention to the Congress and the country to the urgent need for adequate national defense. The difficulty has been that some of our now intensely critical statesmen have apparently neither been interested nor cooperative in matters of national defense, and many Members of this House have used every excuse imaginable in efforts to thwart and delay the President in his efforts to induce Congress to get our own Nation's house in order from the standpoint of national defense.

To be specific, if you examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will find it bulging with speeches, especially from the

Republican side of the aisle, in which questions are asked as to who or what countries the President proposes to prepare against. In all fairness I think it is true that the gentleman from Missouri has generally supported the President's defense program. And yet the record shows that when the President was asking for only 5,500 modern planes, less than a year ago, that the gentleman from Missouri, as usual, was not in agreement with the President's proposal. On June 21, 1939, as shown on page 7657 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] was addressing the House in support of the President's proposal to immediately construct 5,500 bombers and planes and yielded to the gentleman from Missouri, who made the following significant observation:

"If we purchase immediately up to the number of 5,500 planes, is there not grave danger of these planes being obsolete by the time they are complete?"

The gentleman from Missouri proceeded to argue as his excuse for opposing the President's proposal that \$56,000,000 appropriation for these fighting planes would be "too much strain on the taxpayers." It is further significant that the gentleman from Missouri, who now has the unmitigated gall to criticize the President for what he calls tardiness in presenting his defense program to Congress, actually supported the amendment as shown by the record, that if adopted would have prohibited the construction in excess of 1,000 planes in any 1 year. That, bear in mind, was in 1939. Yet he has the temerity to criticize caustically the President of the United States for "tardiness and short vision" in matters of national defense. [Applause.]

If you will take the time to read the many eloquent speeches made by the gentleman from Missouri—and I am glad to say that most of them are worth reading—you will find that he has repeatedly called attention to the fact that there are 3,000 miles of water between the United States and Europe, and 5,000 miles between this country and Japan and that he has also time and again ridiculed the suggestion that the United States could possibly be vulnerable to any foe. As late as November 1939 the distinguished gentleman from Missouri scoffed at the suggestion that if one belligerent should win the present European war, America might be the next object of attack. But we were assured then by the gentleman from Missouri that such a possibility was remote, because of the fact that "there are 3,000 miles of dangerous water between us and any possible danger in spite of advancements of science."

The tactics of the gentleman from Missouri and some other Republican spellbinders in attempting to hamstring the President and delay his national-defense program, reminds me very much of the tactics of some shortsighted, obstreperous objectors to adequate and modern defense preparations in certain European countries.

It is the same tactics used by the opposition in Czechoslovakia for several years prior to the Hitler invasion of that helpless and defenseless little country. When I was in Czechoslovakia in the fall of 1937, I was assured by some of the Czech leaders that the mountain pass on the boundary between Germany and Czechoslovakia was an impassable barrier. To prove their point I was shown how the heavy artillery of Czechoslovakia was trained on the only two mountain passes where they said it would be humanly possible for the German Army to cross.

It is the same argument that was used by the critics and objectors and even those engaged in "fifth column" activities in Norway, Finland, Holland, Denmark, and poor, unfortunate Belgium. It is the same argument that was used by Sir Oswald Moseley and other bitter critics and objectors to every reasonable effort made by Great Britain to prepare against her enemies. Today, Great Britain is paying the price in the sacrifice of her manhood and the possible loss of her possessions.

I do not, Mr. Chairman, follow such short-sighted, inconsistent, impracticable statesmanship. I have never voted against a defense bill on land, water, or in the air since I have been a Member of Congress. There have been times when

I have doubted the wisdom of constructing some of the capital battleships and have many times suggested that I thought it was more practical and better national defense to build small but fast and powerful destroyers, pocket battleships, submarines, and to build a much greater number of them. I have pointed out that it takes from 4 to 5 years to build a capital battleship that might be destroyed by a direct hit of a single bomb from the air. I have advocated the building of many additional airplane carriers and an air force second to none of any country on the face of the globe. Time and again from the Well of this House I have urged that we should have the most powerful fighting planes in the world. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Missouri speaks almost tearfully about the "softies" that are being nursed and nourished during the present generation and under the present national administration. I trust that the "softies" out in his district read his speech today. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I want to tell the gentleman there are no "softies" in the State of Missouri. There were none in the last World War, and there will not be any if we get into a war again.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank my distinguished colleague and am, of course, delighted to hear him defend the fine patriotic citizens from the great Commonwealth of Missouri. I might say to him that I have a number of relatives living in the district of the gentleman who talks of our citizens becoming "softies." Some have been overcome by his eloquence, as well as his pleasing personality and persuasive arguments, and have actually voted for him, but I know some of that sturdy stock in southwest Missouri and I do not really believe they are as soft as he thinks even though they have apparently fallen for some of his soft utterances.

Despite the many criticisms that have been hurled against the Roosevelt administration, and all efforts of the leadership of this House, to bring about an adequate defense program, I do not hesitate to predict that there will not be six votes against the pending bill. The American people demand that Congress do its full duty today and next week in the passage of these important defense bills. Adequate preparedness is the greatest insurance policy that we could possibly have. Let us write that insurance by such an overwhelming vote that it will resound around the globe and in the oft-repeated words of the gentleman from Missouri while we pray for peace let us keep our powder dry.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, we are debating today a bill which may be one of the most important measures that has been considered by this body within a generation.

We are a peaceful Nation; we have no desire for foreign conquest. We earnestly hope that America will never be drawn into any foreign war. We hope with all our hearts that no American boy shall again cross the seas to fight on foreign soil.

It is possible that at this moment America stands at the crossroads of destiny. Our situation today bears certain resemblances to a time more than 150 years ago when our forefathers fought against the armed might of a British King in order that there might be established here on this great continent a land where men might enjoy the blessings of liberty; a land where every man would be able to worship God according to his own conscience; a land where there should be equal opportunities for all and special privileges for none; a land where every man could choose the occupation or calling of his desire, and seek happiness where he found it. We Americans of today are moved by an unconquerable determination to protect and defend this rich heritage.

This greatest of all experiments in human liberty has produced a mighty Nation of 130,000,000 people, the like of

which the world has never known before. As the decades have come and gone we have been deeply thankful that we are more than 3,000 miles from the turbulent and war-torn shores of Europe and of Asia. We have relied upon our position of isolation and the unquestioned bravery of our citizens for protection.

Upon every battlefield in which our country has been engaged, from Bunker Hill to Chateau Thierry, the courage and superb fighting qualities of the American soldier have been unquestioned.

WE NEED DEFENSIVE ARMS

It has been truthfully said that no hostile foreign army could step upon our shores and conquer us. I believe that still to be true; but every thinking man must realize today that the rapidly changing and shifting course of human events and the unbelievable progress in science and invention have brought about a situation where no longer flesh and blood and courage can stand alone against the mighty engines of death that the genius of mankind has invented.

How frequently during the months that have gone by have we seen this fact demonstrated again and again! Today we are witnessing the greatest conflict of all times, featured by lightning attacks upon armies and civilians alike behind flaming machines of human destruction.

If America is to survive, we must look to our mechanized defenses, for which this bill provides, and to our ability to pull together as a united and patriotic Nation.

We have planes; we have ships; we have guns; but we need more of them.

Every patriotic man and woman has a sacred duty to perform. Let us put our shoulders to the wheel. Let us give our President the fullest support in the same program of defense and rearmament which he has proposed.

This is a time when America must stand united. Every fiber of our strength; every wheel of our vast industrial organization, and every resource of a great and ingenious people must be bent to the all-important purpose of arming to preserve and defend those things in America which we hold dearer than life itself.

PRESIDENT ACTS TO STOP "FIFTH COLUMN"

Under the Constitution of our United States, our President is recognized as the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. As such he occupies that role as well as the head of the executive branch of our Government.

Knowing well that internal dissensions and the marching of a "fifth column" in the United States in times of any national emergency can destroy the full force of our defending Army and Navy, President Roosevelt has used the recent knowledge of what happened in Norway, Holland, Belgium, Poland, and Czechoslovakia to strengthen our own domestic and civil government as a part of our preparedness. The extermination and mop-up of the "fifth column" in the United States has begun.

Pending before the Congress is the fifth reorganization bill which would transfer the Immigration and Naturalization Service, with its far-reaching personnel and documentary evidence, to the Department of Justice where the Federal Bureau of Investigation can ferret out and chase those scoundrels to earth who would form the nucleus of any "fifth column."

During the last World War we found out what saboteurs and syndicalists could do to undermine our hurried preparedness for the conflict. The I. W. W. organization alone destroyed factories and wrecked trains loaded with food and equipment for our soldiers and sailors. We were not prepared then as we hope to be this time to avert such outbreaks.

The Congress through its investigating committees in recent years, has revealed the impelling forces of those who by subterfuge and connivance sought to undermine our Government. Those agents of foreign powers alone could form the nucleus for the "fifth column."

The Bureau of Investigation, using the findings of our committees and its own investigations together with the strength and power of the laws under which the Immigration and Naturalization Service operate, would be a most potent factor in stamping out any possible and latent insurrections.

The Congress should act immediately to approve the President's reorganization proposal.

GEAR OUR INDUSTRY TO THE TASK

In this fateful hour the words of President Washington, the Father of our Country, come to us through the decades of the past as live and as true as they were then when they were uttered: "To be prepared for war is the most effectual means of preserving the peace."

We must stay out of Europe's war, but we must so arm and be so strong that no hostile force will for a moment dare to attack our shores.

Industry and business must cooperate to transform part of our peacetime production to producing our defense armaments.

Our great motorcar industry is turning out millions of automobiles every year. Why should it not be turning out tanks and airplane engines with which to defend the right to drive those pleasure cars in peace?

Every factory in America capable of producing the things that we need for self-defense should immediately be placed upon a 24-hour basis. Somebody has said, "Let's stop this hysterical chatter." They say that America is in no great danger. I hope that is true. No doubt it is true, if America will only get ready.

There are, however, thinking men in America who are disturbed over the present situation.

SEES OUR POSSIBLE DANGER

At this point I am going to read excerpts from an article by Harlan Miller that recently appeared in one of the Washington newspapers. The article was written by a well-known columnist, and is an expression of the deep concern which some people are feeling as to what might take place in the event the British Navy were seized by Fuehrer Hitler.

A part of Mr. Miller's commentary is as follows:

EYES ON BRITAIN'S FLEET—ENGLAND'S \$10,000,000,000 SEA POWER, SAFE FROM HITLER, WOULD GIVE AMERICAN DEFENSE EXTRA YEARS OF GRACE

In the Capital's highest official circles a single anxiety has, during the last 24 hours, emerged with overwhelming force from the vague forebodings of the last 10 days, that the British Fleet must at all costs be preserved and kept out of Hitler's hands, no matter how complete a Nazi victory.

The fog has cleared away. The wishful thinking that the Nazis can't smash to victory this summer is dying. With it has passed any doubt that Hitler will demand the fleet.

There is no doubt that he will enforce this demand with the most brutal threats of mass murder and devastation in England.

And there is no longer any doubt he will carry out these threats, even if it means the demolition of every great English city and the destruction of millions of English lives—men, women, and children.

In a sardonic vein, an observer here told a high official that his most optimistic mental image for the last week has been one of the British Fleet steaming desperately westward across the Atlantic with the Nazi bombers in swift pursuit beyond Ireland.

"That is an optimistic dream," said the high official grimly. "If Hitler demands the fleet and if the alternative is a brutal and murderous assault on a defenseless England, there is little reason to think that the British won't surrender it."

With the British Fleet intact, and based either in Canada or the West Indies or at Singapore, leaving our fleet undivided either in the Pacific or the Atlantic, this country would have several years to prepare for any assault on the Western Hemisphere—assaults by trade pressure with political strings attached, by "fifth columns," or by Nazi-inspired revolutions in South America or by armed forces.

Without the fleet in his power, any demands by Hitler for Allied possessions in the Americas would be mere empty bluster. At worst, he'd need 5 years to build one.

With the British Fleet he might conceivably be able to seize some of them—Bermuda, Nassau, Jamaica, Trinidad, Nova Scotia—within a year.

Our fleet would not be able to cope with him and Japan simultaneously. Our air force is still insufficient to resist. Even the Panama Canal would not be safe.

The statement I have just read shows a definite need that we should be fully informed at all times on controversial matters so that the Nation can act wisely and in unanimity. Our free press and radio assure that forum of discussion.

STIFLE WARMONGERS' PROPAGANDA

Yet warmongers and war machines may seek to confuse our minds by prejudicial untruths spread in the form of their propaganda. We do not want such a Trojan horse in our midst, but we must preserve our free press and radio.

LXXXVI—431

Pending before the Senate's Audit and Control Committee now is a resolution to provide funds for the operation of a special committee, already authorized by vote of the Senate, for the purpose of investigating all war propaganda. Today, because of the heavy emphasis placed upon propaganda agencies of war machines, we cannot get all of the facts in a cold and impartial form, but in a form that often tends to inflame and prejudice us.

I am happy to say that a Senator from my home State of Missouri, Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, son of our World War Speaker, and himself an officer in the last World War, is the sponsor of the resolution to investigate the sources and forms of such propaganda which warmongers would have us accept as the whole truth only for their own selfish ends.

In this manner the Congress can cooperate with the executive branch of the Government and keep itself and the citizens, who need to know all of the truth in times of national emergencies, informed as to what is going on.

We must not make mistakes. They might be costly and result in the loss of human lives to say nothing of the dangers that might result toward the destruction of our national freedom and liberties.

I fear, however, that Senator CLARK has not asked for enough money for his investigation, although I have not talked with him about it. I fear that such an extensive investigation, to be most effective, should be financed by a greater sum than \$25,000, and respectfully urge the members of the Audit and Control Committee of the Senate, if I may properly do so, to increase that sum to \$100,000. The unused balance could be returned to the Treasury when the emergency has passed.

MUST APPROPRIATE NEEDED FUNDS

A few days ago when the President of the United States addressed a joint session of the Senate and House in this room all America listened with bated breath when he asked the Congress for an immediate and huge appropriation for the purpose of rearmament. Many an American mother, listening to the radio in her home, thanked God in her heart that we have a President today who is a man of decision, action, and leadership.

If the time should ever come that we have to fight for our liberties and for our very existence, let us hope that American men and boys will not be slaughtered because we have been negligent in giving them the mechanized instrumentalities with which to fight and defend our country.

The sum asked for in the President's program, while great in one way, is infinitely small when compared with the vast resources of our country. For one, I wish that the President had asked for more instead of for less. We must protect this great Nation of ours.

Let us do our part to start the factories moving.

Let us do our part to be prepared.

This is our America. Let us keep it for Americans. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT] such time as he may desire.

ROAD IMPROVEMENT IS AN ESSENTIAL PART OF OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, just at this time, with the turmoil and uncertainty throughout the world in reference to the actual safety of many governments and the lives of their people, we are brought face to face with the requirement in this country that we should leave nothing undone that would provide for our national defense.

No controversy exists as to the necessity of our people making extensive provisions for defense under the supervision of the War Department and the Navy Department, but it is equally as important in national defense that we should see that our highways are so constructed that their use may be effective in carrying out the needs of these two arms of our national defense. The State highway departments have not been remiss in making a study of this situation. For several years they have made a very close inspection of the condition of their main highways. In the testimony before the Roads Committee they gave us itemized statements of the roads which need widening, reconstructing,

and relocating to carry the traffic that the War Department might need. They have been in close touch with the War Department, and that Department has given hearty cooperation in the selection of roads of major importance for our national defense. The highway departments have filed a statement with the Roads Committee giving definite information as to these roads which need this construction.

In addition to the highways themselves, there are many bridges which need strengthening, and in many cases new bridges will be required in order to carry the load needed by the War Department. This statement from the State highway departments, given by States, in estimated mileages and costs, makes a grand total of \$3,945,000,000. The highway departments, with the funds available to them for building purposes, have been reconstructing these roads and bridges as rapidly as they have been able with the money that has been provided. The road and bridge engineers do not do their work under the special inspiration of band music and the unfurling of flags, but our mechanized movement of troops would make sorry headway if these engineers had not prepared a way for their rapid and safe transportation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of War to provide necessary construction, rehabilitation, and installation at military posts, depots, stations, and other localities of plants, buildings, facilities, and utilities and appurtenances thereto, including the acquisition of such land as may be necessary, for the manufacture, maintenance, and storage of military equipment, munitions, and supplies: *Provided*, That section 1136 of the Revised Statutes and all statutes imposing a monetary limitation on any individual project of construction are suspended until and including June 30, 1942: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1941 flying cadets may be enlisted in such number as may be deemed necessary, except that the average number of flying cadets shall not exceed 8,500; and that an average of 6,000 Reserve Air Corps officers, irrespective of grades, may be ordered to extend active duty with the Air Corps: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1941 existing limitations as to the number of serviceable airplanes, airships, and free and captive balloons with which the Air Corps is authorized to be equipped and maintained are likewise suspended: *Provided further*, That in order to expedite the building up of the national defense during the fiscal year 1941, moneys authorized to be appropriated for the purposes mentioned in this act may be made available for the employment of such additional personnel without regard to civil-service requirements and restrictions of law relating thereto at the seat of Government or elsewhere as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, printing and binding, communication service, supplies, extended active duty of Reserve officers, and travel expenses: *Provided further*, That in connection with the defense program of the United States the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, sec. 652), may be waived in any case when approved by the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1941 the President may assign enlisted men to the branches of the Army in such numbers as he considers necessary, irrespective of the limitations on the strength of any particular branch set forth in the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended. An account shall be kept of all expenditures made or authorized under this section, and a report of such expenditures and of contracts therefor shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each session subsequent to the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 2, line 18, after the word "personnel," strike out the following language: "without regard to civil-service requirements and restrictions of law relating thereto."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to which I referred in my opening remarks on this bill. It takes care of the civil-service question raised by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of this bill before the committee not one officer connected with the general staff of the Army asked that this provision of the bill be eliminated. As a matter of fact, this provision in the bill came

from those who originally wrote the bill and placed it before the committee.

I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that one of the chief reasons that this country finds itself inadequately prepared to meet an emergency today is because throughout the past we have listened to the arguments of the theorists, the sentimentalists, and the impractical visionaries. That is exactly what the civil service represents, lock, stock, and barrel.

Another thing about this civil service in connection with a program of this kind is that it is absolutely necessary in connection with such a program, first and foremost, to have men in the employ of the War Department or the Navy Department, if you please, whose loyalty and allegiance to this Nation is absolutely beyond question. [Applause.] What an opportunity the civil service will furnish for Trojan horses, "fifth columns," spies, or saboteurs. These vermin will take the fullest advantage of the red tape and impractical methods of the civil service and will cause much damage. I defy any man who has had any experience with those chosen by the civil service to show me where in all these appointments they have paid any attention to the allegiance or loyalty or patriotism of any man they have chosen. Can we expect they will do so in the future? Can we expect in the future when they choose men in connection with this program that they will go into the question of whether these men are loyal to this Nation or whether they are loyal to Germany or Russia or Italy or Japan? Have we not had plenty of experience with the Civil Service Commission in filling certain departments of this Government with Communists? How about the Social Security? In this Department a sizable sum was collected during the Spanish civil war and was wired to the Spanish Communists. How about other departments filled by the civil service which are filled with men whose loyalty to this Nation is certainly questionable? If the civil service is to be given charge of furnishing men for this purpose, they will furnish men for use in connection with a program of this kind such as they have furnished before. An officer in the Army was telling me day before yesterday of the difficulties he had had in getting inspectors through the civil service. He was looking for inspectors of ordnance to inspect field pieces, rifles, and various other ordnance material. The Civil Service Commission insisted on sending him men who had been clothing inspectors. [Laughter.] That was the result of this impractical, theoretical method of choosing men.

There is another thing that can be said about the civil service. If they are allowed to choose these men, they will spend more money examining applicants for these positions than the salary of the men who receive the positions will amount to. The other day I called up the Civil Service Commission to ask how soon the grades would be out on a certain examination, and I was told not for 6 months yet, and I said, "Not for 6 months? The examination was given 6 months ago." "Oh, well," they said, "there were several hundred thousand people who took that examination." I said, "In the name of common sense, how many positions are to be filled?" Well, they did not know, but I found out that it was in the neighborhood of 7 or 10, and yet several hundred thousand people had been examined to fill somewhere between 7 and 10 positions. I ask you, Is this economy or efficiency?

If we put on a program of this kind, for heaven's sake put the program on in such a way that we can get a dollar's worth of work done for a dollar expended. [Applause.] No man connected with this Government who came through the civil service was ever interested in giving a dollar's worth of work for a dollar of salary. They are contented to watch the clock to see when they can put on their coats and rush out. That is no place to get these men from. For heaven's sake, let us give the officers of the Army all the opportunity possible to choose men according to the patriotism, the qualifications, and the dependability that are so necessary in positions of this kind.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. This amendment was defeated on a vote in the committee, was it not?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes; it was overwhelmingly defeated in the committee on a vote, and I will ask the chairman of the committee if any officer in any way connected with the Army made the request in front of the committee that this provision be stricken out. I will ask that, in all fairness to the man who introduced this amendment.

Mr. MAY. Let me answer the gentleman by saying that in the first place the Army legislative counsel drew the original bill with the amendment I have offered in it. They then came before the committee and General Gasser urged that it be stricken out and stated that he had made satisfactory arrangements and had a thorough understanding with the Civil Service Commission and that they could operate better with the amendment as I have suggested than they could otherwise.

Mr. FADDIS. And in connection with that, just the same, they expressed doubt in front of that committee that they would be able to secure the proper personnel in connection with it. I hope this amendment will be rejected. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in support of the amendment. There is no occasion to become excited over this provision, because the committee thoroughly considered it, and after it was considered by the committee and after we had had the hearings on it, the Civil Service Commission asked to be heard. One of the three Commissioners of the Civil Service Commission appeared before us. I do not recall his name. The matter was considered very carefully and it was decided to retain that part of the section which would authorize the Secretary of War in case he found some of the class referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], whose patriotism was questioned, or who for any other reason was an undesirable employee, to make recommendation to the Commission, and the Commission agreed to, and will always under those circumstances, discharge that employee.

In addition to that, the President of the United States already has the power under the existing civil service statutes to enforce that exact provision; in other words to enforce the civil-service law so as to protect us from Communists, reds, and "fifth columnists."

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. What are these positions that have to be filled? Are they to be filled by men of military experience in the Army, or are they civilian positions to be held by women and girls?

Mr. MAY. They are all civilian positions in the War Department in the way of stenographers and secretaries and civilian employees generally. This does not apply to the strictly military personnel, but to mechanics, carpenters, and so forth.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Did not some of the generals appearing in behalf of this bill state that they had trouble in the past with the Civil Service in obtaining proper help, that the Civil Service had promised to do it, and did not keep their word before?

Mr. MAY. I don't remember any such testimony as that.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. The gentleman was there, and he should remember it.

Mr. MAY. I am always there when there are hearings.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. The gentleman voted for this civil-service elimination.

Mr. MAY. Yes, I did; but upon information of an official character I have since received I am convinced it was a mistake.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. The Quartermaster General, I believe, testified that he had some difficulty in getting qualified carpenters but stated that he was satisfied under the revision of the procedure which has been agreed upon that he could get perfectly qualified men without elimination of the civil service, and it was testified by the civil-service representatives that an organization exists between the Civil Service and the Employment Service which will make available to the Army an employment service which will enable the Army to obtain this civilian personnel much more quickly and much better than they can if they tried now to set up an organization of their own to obtain civilian personnel. The elimination of this exemption by adopting the chairman's amendment will put back in force the civil-service law. The President already has the power to suspend it in an emergency. There is included in this bill a suspension of the right of appeal on dismissal, so that a man may be dismissed at any time for any reason, if the Secretary of War decides that his presence in the civilian personnel is not desirable. That is in another provision in this particular bill.

Mr. HOUSTON. And he has no right of appeal?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. He has no right of appeal under this bill. Also, of course, during the World War the civil-service requirements were kept in effect, and we have always considered that positions were filled in a better manner than they would have been if we had not had them in effect.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have been advised by the War Department since the hearings, that the provision which we wrote into the bill would merely obstruct the present emergency program, and that it is absolutely essential and necessary that this amendment be adopted if they are to function properly.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman said it would be possible under this bill to do away with competitive bidding.

Mr. MAY. It will be possible, but there is no intention of nullifying the statute relative to competitive bidding except in cases of imperative emergency where the greatest speed is required. Nor is it intended that any large contracts will be let without proper provision for the strongest competition.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. But you do feel this will save a great deal of time?

Mr. MAY. Yes; it will. And as everyone now knows, in modern warfare if we are not fully prepared our efforts at peace will be hopeless.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am not clear from the language whether the acquisition of land for airports will be authorized. It says here "land for maintenance of facilities."

Mr. MAY. I think the Wilcox Act is the act under which they are authorized to procure land for air bases.

Mr. BREWSTER. There would be no extension of that authority under this measure?

Mr. MAY. No; not under this bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. They did not consider that to be necessary?

Mr. MAY. Not in view of the Wilcox Act, but we will very likely present other legislation for land acquisition soon.

My question is, Will it be possible for the War Department to use like judgment in connection with the Walsh-Healey bill, or will the Walsh-Healey bill provisions obtain regardless of whether or not they interfere with the progress of the program?

This bill does not affect the Walsh-Healey Act in any respect, and is not intended to.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Under this program how many pilots will the Army be able to train every year?

Mr. MAY. Seven thousand is the number authorized, and we are told by the Chief of the Air Corps that to get 7,000 they will have to process about 84,000.

Mr. SUTPHIN. How many can the Army train each year?

Mr. MAY. An average of 8,500, the idea being that they may have 7,000 or 6,000 at one time, and possibly during the year they might have as many as 10,000. The number 8,500 is what might be said to be a base average.

Mr. SUTPHIN. How many does the gentleman think will finish their training?

Mr. MAY. I have no idea. The number we have set to complete and take into the service is 7,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to close my remarks on this bill, but since it is probably the last major piece of legislation my committee will bring to the floor of the House during this session, I should feel derelict in my duty if I did not make some reference to the Secretary of War and his military advisers. In my opinion there has been no more able or earnest Secretary of War than the Honorable Harry H. Woodring since the stormy days of the World War when that great American, Newton D. Baker, held that very important post. He is aggressive, yet cool and determined upon a program of efficiency and with strict honesty and justice to all. Under him is that aggressive young and brilliant assistant, Col. Lewis Johnson in charge of procurement. A good team, and to me, the Chief of the General Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, is one of the greatest soldiers I have ever known. At all times during all the elaborate hearings we have held over the many months it has required, he has been frank and sincere. He knows his job and is a tireless worker. I am sure our country is safe and secure with such great leadership. I trust this bill may pass without a dissenting vote. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 112, noes 88.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. FADDIS to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 145 and noes 110.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: Pages 2 and 3, line 23, after the word "expenses", in line 23, page 2, strike out the following: "Provided further, That in connection with the defense program of the United States the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, sec. 652), may be waived in any case when approved by the Secretary of War", and insert the following: "Provided further, To strengthen the national defense and protect the national security every officer, official, and employee of the United States Government and of each and every department, bureau, and agency thereof, regardless of position, class, grade, rating, or duties, who is not an American citizen, shall be discharged and removed from the Government service within 60 days after the passage of this act."

"The fact that a person in the classified civil service is not an American citizen shall, under the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, sec. 652), be sufficient cause for the removal for cause of such person from said service: Provided, The requirements of this proviso may be modified or suspended as to such persons employed in the Foreign Service of the United States and in the Panama Canal Zone as the Secretary of State, in his discretion, may find should be continued in said Foreign Service or in the Panama Canal Zone without endangering the defense and security of the United States."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it deals with agencies that do not come within the scope of this bill. Therefore it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PACE. If the Chair desires to hear me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, if there is any question in the mind of the Chair as to the germaneness of the amendment, I refer you to the title of the pending bill, which is "To expedite the strengthening of the national defense." The portion of the bill, lines 23, 24, and 25, on page 2, and lines 1, 2, and 3, on page 3, is a proviso permitting the waiving of the provisions of section 6 on the recommendation or approval of the Secretary of War.

Section 6 is the section dealing with the removal for cause of a person engaged in the classified civil service. It applies only, Mr. Chairman, to one branch of the Government service, that is, to the War Department. It says that on the approval of the Secretary of War, the provisions with reference to the removal for cause, for hearing, counter-hearing, affidavits, evidence, and so forth, may be waived.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, in view of the title of the pending bill, "To expedite the strengthening of the national defense," it is in order. It is recognized today, Mr. Chairman, that what is known as the "fifth column" is as much an implement of war as are the first, second, third, and fourth. Certainly there can be no measure contributing more to the defense of this Nation, the purpose of this bill, than to know that those engaged in the conduct of the affairs of Government are loyal American citizens.

So this amendment simply provides that instead of merely the Secretary of War having the right to waive the provisions of section 6, the fact that a person in the Government service or in the classified civil service is not an American citizen, is declared to be cause for his removal for cause.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, under every view of the spirit of the law, the purpose of the bill, the language of the bill, the purpose for which we are meeting here today, to expedite the defense of this Nation, the Congress on this occasion has a right to declare that the affairs of this Government shall be intrusted only to the hands of loyal American citizens.

The bill expressly provides that the President shall spend the money authorized by this bill "through the appropriate agencies of the Government," which is just as broad as my amendment.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this amendment, it will apply to the activities of the War Department wherever they may reach. In that connection, it must be kept in mind the Panama Canal, the Railroad Shipping Board, and other agencies in connection with the War Department. At the present time, upon authority of a statement made on the floor of this House not many days ago, I believe by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], it has been brought to light that there are many advocates of communism in the employ of some of the agencies in connection with the Panama Canal. I have not had time to look up the remarks of the gentleman on that subject, but I believe that the status of this and other agencies are sufficient to make this amendment germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOEHNE). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that section 6 takes in every phase of the War Department. The Chair is also of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia goes entirely beyond the scope of the bill under consideration, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the pleasing—yes, always pleasing remarks of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. Having in mind, as we all must on this occasion, world conditions that exist, as I sat in this Chamber, knowing the great capacity of the gentleman from Missouri, I hoped for, and I expected a speech that would be one of the outstanding in the entire history of the Congress of the United States. He had the opportunity and the setting. At moments he lifted himself, or appeared to lift himself, to great heights,

and then political considerations came into his mind, and he lowered himself to the level of partisan political attack.

The gentleman from Missouri has great capacity. The gentleman from Missouri is one whom I admire and respect. I expected a speech calling for unity, not only political unity but unity among labor, unity industrially, unity among all groups of American citizens. To my disappointment, if not dismay, during his remarks I heard a résumé of the political skeletons of the past, and the final thought in my mind was that instead of an appeal for unity it was an appeal for greater uncertainty, for more disunity.

A democracy must work. In order for a democracy to work it must serve its people not only under normal conditions but in a crisis, actual or imminent. When a crisis besets this country, such as war, for example, public opinion makes all little differences sink into insignificance in the greater danger that confronts us, and public opinion brings about unity because our people realize that nations are like individuals, that the law of self-preservation applies to a nation just the same as it does to an individual. The weakness is that prior to the occurring of the actual catastrophe, when we see the danger signals and warnings, as in this case throughout the world, at that time, in a democracy, unity must be voluntary. It is difficult to obtain. This is the most trying period, the period of preparation, because no matter how much we may argue one way or the other, no matter how much one may blame the Members on one side or the other of this aisle, the indisputable fact remains that after a war has started, or has been hurled upon us, we cannot prepare an Army and a Navy and an air force to meet the problems of modern warfare and to assure proper defense. We all know that warfare has changed entirely not only on sea but on land. Although we have 3,000 miles of protecting sea on each side of us, it is absolutely essential that our country be prepared as never before.

Modern warfare, with its terrible destructiveness, shows conclusively that a nation must be prepared before it is attacked. We have seen what has happened to other great and powerful nations who were not prepared, due in the main to a lack of unity existing. We have seen in other countries the results of uncertainty of leadership in the preparations of national defense; of the results of false pacifism; of the appeals of the false prophets; of political and industrial uncertainty; of group hatred existing among a people; and of the appeals to fears, emotions, and prejudices. Unity, in all respects, and among all of our people, and particularly politically and industrially, must exist prior to actual war in order that a nation will be prepared to meet an imminent attack. War, if thrust upon us, will not await our convenience to meet it. The enemy will not await our convenience to meet its attack. With unity existing and our beloved country prepared, we need have no feelings of fear of the results.

Our country, properly prepared, is undefeatable. It is our duty, it is our obligation, without regard to our personal ambitions or political welfare, to see that our country is prepared.

In voting appropriations and enacting legislation to assure complete and adequate national defense, we must recognize that the old order of warfare has ceased. Much as we dislike the destructive weapons and methods of modern warfare, the laws of self-preservation demand that we have more destructive weapons of warfare than any other probable opponent or opponents who might combine to attack us. Unfortunate as it is, the best road to peace is to have a navy, an army, marine corps, and an air force with weapons at their command that will instill fear and respect into the minds of other nations who follow the vicious policy of "might is right." This, of necessity, must be our policy of national defense until all of the powerful nations of the world have returned to reason. The price that we pay is the premium that we must pay for national protection. We must prepare upon the policy of maximum and not minimum defense facilities. We must keep in mind that the best defense is a good offense. A national defense that creates in the minds of other nations, feelings of respect and fear of our ability to

defend ourselves is the best means of maintaining a lasting peace for our country.

By preparing from now on, we will be serving notice on the world that the United States of today, which we have inherited from past generations, will be transmitted by us to future generations of Americans in the form that we received and inherited it, a nation of free people.

The few remarks I made I hope will not be futile. I hope they will bear some fruit. This is the time when we need unity, unity politically and industrially—unity among all. This applies to the political party in control of Government; it applies to the leadership and the membership of the present administration in bringing about unity; it applies to the leadership and the membership of the minority party. We need unity politically and unity industrially. We need unity among all of our people. We are preparing not for war but for peace. The present conflict shows that the best assurance of peace is an adequate preparation against war. I hope that from now on we in this Chamber will make such expressions as will be consistent with unity and that unity, particularly at this time, will exist among all the people of the country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DITTER) there were—ayes 119, noes 96.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. MAY.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 147, noes 111.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 1, line 4, after the word "appropriated" strike out "such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of War," and insert the figure "\$2,000,000,000."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] said we should have unity. He is right. He also told us we must make democracy work. Again he is correct. How are we to have unity with the kind of procedure followed by the majority a moment ago when it limited debate on the section and all amendments thereto to 5 minutes, shut off all further amendments to a section which authorizes the expenditure of unlimited sums? How are we to have unity when you deny to us the right of fair discussion? You know you cannot get unity in that manner. You can keep us down so long as you have the votes, but you cannot make us like it and you cannot make us quit, and the day will come when your arbitrary tactics will react and defeat you.

I want to make a confession of ignorance—probably you are all aware of it anyway—that is that I do not know anything about the amount we should have to adequately prepare for defense. Nor do I know anything about the methods we should follow. With all due respect to the other Members of the House, may I suggest that I am not alone in my ignorance. I am willing to go along with the War and the Navy Departments and to vote for any sum they may ask, for the responsible heads of those departments and their personnel are our experts and from their advice we must draw our conclusions. But, after all, if we are to have unity, that unity should be under a constitutional form of government. That does not mean giving up all our thought and all our judgment to the thought and the judgment of one man or group of men.

The gentleman said that we must make democracy work, meaning, I presume, that we must make democracy successful; that, to that end, we must have unity.

True, our Nation must, through democracy, act toward one purpose—the preservation of our liberty and independence; the prosperity of our people. But democracy is not democracy if one of the constitutional divisions of our Government, the Congress, is deprived of its constitutional functions. Should all go along with what appears to be the present program, then we shall have no democracy. If Congress is to yield its judgment, refuse to perform its duty under the Constitution to make appropriations, to shape our legislation, and, on the plea of unity, substitute the judgment of the War or the Navy Department or of the Executive or his advisers, then democracy here has ceased to exist and we have a dictatorship.

Make democracy work and have unity? You know it cannot be done by the representatives of the people following blindly and without question other departments of the Government.

If it be the purpose of the new dealers, as it seems to be, to establish a dictator in the place and stead of a Chief Executive, whose authority and power is limited by the Constitution and the laws of the land, and in the place of a Congress, speaking the will of the people, then come out from behind the smoke screen of relief, so-called social legislation, a front of preparedness, and declare the issue to be what apparently it is, and let the people vote on that question.

The majority will, of course, determine our form of government. Stating the issue plainly and clearly, without circumlocution, without the fog created by collateral, incidental, or irrelevant issues and questions of policy, once for all, peaceably and at the ballot box, rather than through bloody revolution, let the people decide for themselves whether we shall continue under a democracy or under a President, so-called, with the power of a dictator.

This bill does not follow the judgment of the War Department, apparently, because it does not place any limit upon the money which is authorized to be appropriated. If the Army wants one billion, two, three, four, or five billion dollars, I have no doubt but that the Republicans will follow the judgment of those who speak for the Army and later the judgment of those who speak for the Navy.

But why should we come in here and fail to exercise the duty which is imposed upon us? Why should we fail to do the thing which we swore we would do when we took our oath of office to perform our duties under the Constitution? Why should we authorize the Secretary of War to expend any amount which in his judgment he deems necessary?

Is it not our duty to listen to the Army and Navy experts—conceding we do not know—to pass upon their statements and other information which we may have; then go along if, in our judgment, that is the proper procedure? When we have a bill here which authorizes one department of the Government—the War Department—to exercise the functions of Congress and determine the amount to be used, one would think that Congress was never going to meet again—and perhaps that is the plan. If the papers are correct, having voted this unlimited authorization, we are to be sent home and wait then until the President calls us back, if he thinks he needs us.

To date he has never needed us except to pass appropriation bills and bills granting to him more authority. So far, since he has been in office this Congress and the preceding one has gone along with him, usually laying aside its own judgment and following blindly his thinking, his procedure. The result is a deplorable situation, where, in time of the great danger which he says has come to us, we are, according to his statement, wholly unprepared to meet that danger.

Having heretofore failed to make its own independent investigations; to formulate its legislation; having accepted what has been handed to it, Congress shares the responsibility.

Congressmen are elected to represent the people, not 2 months, 3 months, or 6 months of each year, but throughout each day, each week, each month of each 2-year term.

Just as long as there is congressional business—that is, appropriations to be made, ways devised to meet those appropriations, laws to be enacted, amended, or clarified to remedy conditions which exist—it is our duty, and our people expect us, to remain here in Washington. Our duty runs through days that are foul as well as through days that are fair. Our duty rests upon us in times of adversity as well as in more prosperous days.

Today we are told that the life of our Nation, the liberty of our people, is at stake. Under the Constitution, we are one of the three great departments of our Government. Shall we now, either for political reasons or because of personal desires, forsake our post of duty, go home and work for reelection? Is that the best we can offer the home folks who sent us here, who place their confidence in us?

The rules do not permit me, nor do I desire, to say that it is cowardly to appropriate billions of dollars, knowing that we must borrow to meet those appropriations, and refuse to enact tax legislation to meet the expenditures which we vote. Without violating the rules of the House, I may say that, to me, it seems selfish to refuse to impose upon ourselves at least a portion of the burdens which we create, which sometime must be met; that, by failing to pass tax legislation and passing only appropriation bills, we have performed but half of our task. Taxes sometime there must be. Let us meet our duty here and now and not confine our activities to the making of patriotic speeches, the appropriating of billions of dollars, to be repaid with interest by future generations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 2. To enable the President, through the appropriate agencies of the Government, to provide for emergencies affecting the national security and defense and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including (1) all of the objects and purposes specified under any appropriation available or to be made available to the War Department for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941; (2) the furnishing of Government-owned facilities at privately owned plants; (3) the procurement and training of civilian personnel necessary in connection with the production of critical and essential items of equipment and material and the use or operation thereof; and (5) the procurement of strategic and critical materials in accordance with the act of June 7, 1939, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, there is authorized to be appropriated \$132,000,000, which may be made immediately and continuously available until June 30, 1942. An account shall be kept of all expenditures made or authorized under this section, and reports of such expenditures and of contracts therefor shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each session subsequent to the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if we may have an agreement as to time on this section and all amendments thereto?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman want to finish tonight?

Mr. MAY. I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman want to vote on the bill?

Mr. MAY. I have agreed with your leader on time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, are you going to give us time to debate this?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the gentleman from New York advise how many amendments his side has?

Mr. ANDREWS. We have 20 minutes.

Mr. MAY. We will take 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that does not include any additional sections that may be offered by way of amendment?

Mr. MAY. Certainly not. This section is this section and additional sections will be additional sections.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 3, line 15, after the comma, and following the word "Government", insert the following language: "without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. ENGEL), there were—ayes 108, noes 46.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 4, line 1, strike out the following language: "without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to transpose those words back to the other section where first adopted. It is just simply a corrective amendment.

Mr. THOMASON. It is offered in conformance with a request made by the legislative counsel?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 3, line 25, strike out the figure (5) and insert in lieu thereof the figure (4).

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARTER of Ohio: Page 4, lines 3 and 4, strike out "which may be made immediately and continuously available until June 30, 1942" and insert: "which may be made continuously available during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942."

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a clarifying amendment to meet a suggestion of the legislative counsel.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This would violate the Constitution, because we are only allowed to make money available in an appropriation for 2 years for the Army.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. I understand that the appropriation measure would have to be worded so that the appropriation would not be available until the beginning of the fiscal year 1941. That is the purpose of the amendment, to meet the situation the gentleman has described.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: On page 3, line 19, after "War Department" insert "for military purposes."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON: Page 4, line 3, strike out "\$132,000,000" and insert "\$182,000,000."

Strike out comma and insert a semicolon and "(6) for materially increasing the training of civilians under the provisions of section 34 (41 Stat. 779); and for training volunteer physically fit male citizens between the ages of 18 and 35, including male citizens en-

rolled in Civilian Conservation Corps, in military science, and the use and care of military weapons. This training shall be under the direction of existing Military Establishments—Regular, Reserve, or National Guard. This training may be given to any volunteer physically fit male citizen without requiring enlistment in any branch of the service."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane, because it includes the National Guard, which is not a Federal organization, and brings into the service another group of persons not contemplated by the measure. National guardsmen are State officials until, of course, the Congress declares an emergency or war.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, the President has already declared a state of national emergency. Even under the limited national emergency, with the world condition as it is, I believe the persons covered by this amendment might be well included in the armed forces. Since the members of the National Guard are to be used in the training of a citizen personnel in the use of firearms which are furnished by the Federal Government, undoubtedly they come within the scope of this section, which grants extraordinary powers to the President and allows him to make certain purchases, and also includes the furnishing of Government-owned facilities and privately owned plants, and the procurement and training of civilian personnel necessary in the production of critical and essential items. Certainly the scope of section 2 would embrace a military establishment if it would allow the use of funds in developing private establishments for the production of war materials.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma whether or not his amendment defines membership in the Civilian Conservation Corps as being mandatory to take this military training.

Mr. FERGUSON. Absolutely not. If I may call it to the attention of the Chair, the amendment reads, "for training volunteer physically fit male citizens."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would also like to ask the gentleman whether the same thing would hold true with the National Guard or the rest of the Military Establishment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Absolutely. It would be a volunteer proposition.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add on the point of order that the position taken by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is untenable, because this bill provides for expediting the strengthening of our national defense, and our National Guard is a major part of our national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair believes that the amendment is in order.

The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not one that criticizes the Army and Navy and their former expenditures. The Navy was sunk by disarmament conferences and starved from lack of appropriations until 1933. Today, due to the leadership of President Roosevelt we have probably the best Navy in the world. Thank God for that. Our defense program has always been predicated on the idea we could get ready for a war after we got into a war. We presumed that our Navy and the English Navy could protect us from attack until we could raise, train, and equip our Army. The loss of the English Navy will completely upset this program. The English Navy is not lost but in this day of new developments we can take no chances. The money that will be provided in the Navy appropriation bill and the Army appropriation bill and for the purposes authorized in the bill before us today all seek to equip our present forces and gear up our industrial machinery for production of vital armaments. Of course, this program must be granted, and speedily. No question but what it will be. But who is going to use these implements of war? We citizens of the United States cannot with lazy indifference say we will depend on our Regular Army, the Reserves, and the National Guard. They are only the front-line defenses. If we are to protect the Americas

the armed forces will have to be augmented by a huge citizen army. Now, that makes this question come before this Congress. How long does it take to train a civilian and make a soldier out of him? And what provisions are made in the three defense measures the Congress will pass on in the next few days? Under the title "Citizen's military training," on page 67 of the Army appropriation bill that will come before the House we will find an item of \$4,931,417, the same sum as we appropriated last year. When we turn to the title "Citizen's military training camps," on page 71 of the same Army appropriation bill, we find under this title the item of \$2,275,000, exactly the same as we provided last year. A grand total of a little over \$7,000,000 to train a volunteer citizen army.

I challenge any Member on this floor to cite me any additional funds that will be used for this purpose. Under this bill the President of the United States is provided with \$132,000,000, to be spent, however, for specific purposes, for speeding up the production of vital war materials. But who is going to use those materials after we supply the Regular armed forces? It must be the citizens of the United States. You cannot take a boy from behind a soda fountain, or from a clothing store, or from the farm, or even from a C. C. C. camp and make a soldier out of him overnight. Even the Regular troops, when asked to maneuver with live ammunition, must be carefully instructed in the use of a rifle or a machine gun to protect those troops from casualties from their own ammunition. This is under peacetime maneuver conditions. No one knows the casualties in the last war caused by men using destructive death-dealing firearms to their own troops because of lack of training.

My amendment provides that the Regular officers, the Reserve officers, and the members of the National Guard can train volunteers from the C. C. C. camps or from any other source, young men who want to be ready to defend the country will have an opportunity to receive the necessary training in the use of weapons, machine guns, and rifles before they are called on to defend this country. This would be an American method, depending on the patriotism of our youth and their desire to acquaint themselves with their duties in the time of war. I know the responses to such a program would be tremendous. I know in our C. C. C. camps a majority of boys would volunteer in their recreation time to learn to use a rifle and machine gun effectively. Yes; we could even put tanks in many localities so that our citizen youth could get the feel of using modern war machines. In addition to this, the very fact these Reserve officers and officers in the National Guard would be called on to train these men would give them excellent instruction in the handling of men.

My amendment also provides for an increase, a material increase, in the funds provided for citizen-military-training camps. By material increase I mean that where we are now training every summer 30,000 young men we should increase this by 10 to 20 or 30 times. I pointed out at the start of my remarks in support of my amendment that only \$2,275,000 is provided in the regular appropriation bill for the citizen's military training camps. Should my amendment fail here today, I will make every effort to increase the amount appropriated for the C. M. T. C. by at least 10 times. Let us not try to save our conscience by saying to the people of this country we have provided all that the Army and Navy have asked for. We have pinched those departments through past years until today we are faced with the stark reality. The only question that should be in the minds of the Members of the House is, What would this country do if it were attacked? What would this country do if any of the American nations were attacked? The answer is we would start training a citizen army and provide it with adequate equipment. The only way we can prevent the inevitable attack on some country in the Americas is to be adequately prepared to meet any such attack from any source.

I hope the House will adopt this amendment which will authorize funds to train our citizen youth so that when the time comes they will be, with minimum training, prepared to enter the service of their country. I sincerely believe that

unless Congress provides for this training we, Congress and Congress alone, will be responsible for the death of thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands of inadequately trained soldiers.

And one more thing. Certainly it is the responsibility of Congress to pass a tax bill to finance our preparedness program.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman realizes, of course, that the National Guard is an organization of its own and the personnel that the Army is taking in is to come from outside the National Guard.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will ask the gentleman this question: How many men would have to be trained, in case this country was invaded by a formidable force, before we had an army that could successfully resist them?

Mr. MAY. That is a military question that some gentleman knowing more about the war than even the gentleman from Oklahoma or myself would have to answer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, never before has this Nation had to face a proposed defense program under such conditions as exist today. Instead of a small national debt there looms before the people a present existing debt in excess of \$45,000,000,000. This is a ghastly spectacle, in the light of present world conditions. It ought to be a sobering thought to every Member of this House.

There is no question about the patriotic fervor with which the American people will meet the demands of the hour for national defense, but what the patriotic citizens of this country have a right to demand and insist upon is that every dollar appropriated for national defense shall be spent without waste and with no thought of political advantage to be gained from its expenditure. The citizens who will have to foot the bill know that the cost will come out of their wages, that it will mean a tightening of the belt. The people have been constantly reminded of the fact by ever-increasing tax bills, although the debt has continued to grow by leaps and bounds.

Now, 130,000,000 people, in the light of the critical situation abroad, stand stunned in the presence of recent disclosures which reveal a state of woeful unpreparedness. They ask, with the deepest concern, what has become of the \$8,000,000,000 appropriated within the past 7 years for preparedness? Who is responsible for the use of this money without results? They have a right to ask these questions. I maintain that they have a right to insist that every vestige of political boondoggling, with the money extracted from them by this administration, be stopped. I believe that an outraged, patriotic people, rightly jealous of their own safety and security, will demand the wise expenditure of this money for national defense—and for no other purpose.

I, for one, deplore the blank-check provision demanded by the President because of the use made of other blank checks during this administration, but I cast my vote for this bill, believing that it is the patriotic thing to do, even though the blank-check provision remains in the bill. I do this because there is no opportunity to vote "no" on the blank-check feature of this bill.

I wish to add further that the \$732,000,000 carried in the President's proposed defense program is only the beginning, and a small beginning of the expenditures that will be required if the administration is in dead earnest to build up the defenses of the country. I repeat that the people will have to sacrifice far more than they now realize to meet the demands that this administration proposes to make upon them because of the wasteful expenditure of billions which should have gone for defense. The people must be further prepared for heavy taxes, and because a tax bill is not presented now—for political reasons—it is inevitable that it must follow at a later date.

Mr. Chairman, speaking of sacrifices on the part of the people, I might illustrate the extent to which economies would have to be exercised in the event that the administration

should stumble upon one of its "steps short of war." I recall an experience of the English people during the World War in 1917. There came a time when they had to eliminate waste in every department of the Government. They had to establish training schools for Army cooks in order to have men qualify to economize in cooking in the war area; they were short of fats, which necessitated the establishment of fat-extracting plants. I had occasion to visit one of these. It was equipped with a receptacle for superheating bones to drive off the fat. The bones were collected from the camps. They were able to save in this way 40 tons of much-needed fats per month.

One byproduct from this plant was glycerin. The fat was sold to the soap manufacturers. The used, bloody, hospital bandages were hauled to a plant where they were washed, sterilized, dried, and baled and sent to the munitions plants. Biscuit and tea tins were put through presses, baled, and sold for \$116 per ton. Tin cans were heated until the solder melted, which was run into ingots and sold for \$1,000 per ton. All glass bottles were saved and sold. Scrap tin from tin cans was used for road building. I wish to emphasize the economies that had to be exercised by the English people, although in the early stages of war rigid economy was not practiced, but the time came when every article, no matter how small the value, was salvaged.

I recall a visit to 1 of 5 boot and shoe departments. I saw 500 men and 200 women employed in this department. They were reconditioning old shoes at the rate of 30,000 per week. They were washed, repaired, oiled, and sent back to the lines. I saw, in the fall of 1917, all that I have described and far more than time will permit me to outline to the House. There was not a thing that could be salvaged that was not salvaged during those dark days.

I feel it my duty during a time when the tidal wave of hysteria is running high, to make the taxpayers realize that they should demand of this administration that of these additional millions now requested for defense not one cent be diverted from its real purpose.

I repeat again that this Nation has never before faced the handicap of a \$45,000,000,000 national debt when called upon to prepare for national defense, such as present world conditions may require. This is not a program which should be entrusted to the whims, the fancies of a group of young "brain trusters," but calls for solid common sense of practical men who will approach the task with wisdom and foresight, based upon successful experience in the fields of industry and engineering.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSSETT: Page 4, line 9, after the period at the end of line 9, insert: "Provided further, That none of the money authorized under this legislation shall be used to pay salaries to any Communist or Fascist."

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have made provision to take the Communists off the W. P. A. In this time of peril, when we are concerned with our national defense, it occurs to me that our Military Establishments certainly ought to be purged of those not devoted and loyal to democratic institutions. This amendment is not far reaching, but at least it establishes a principle. We eliminated some time back in this bill a provision not to require civil-service regulations in the selection of personnel. We have been told on reasonably good authority that through the civil service and other agencies Communists, and others not in sympathy with our Government, are working into important positions in this country. This amendment simply provides that no part of the money authorized by this bill shall go to pay the salaries of Communists, Fascists, or Nazis. It does not go as far as I wish we could go, but it is a step in the right direction. We want no "fifth columns" in this country, most especially in our Army and Navy. I ask the support of this House for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I had not intended to say anything on this bill until we adopted that amendment on the civil service. Can you imagine an army or the navy of civil service? Do you propose to send to the Sperry Gyroscope Works and to some of our munition plants civil-service people to be inspectors of material of whom we have no knowledge other than what the Civil Service Commission tells us? I think it is one of the most criminal things I have heard of in a long time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. No; I will not yield; I have not the time. We seem to think that this is just a little war some place, and that it will be all over in a few days and everybody will go home and call it a day. My friends, we are facing the most serious situation certainly since the worst days of 1918.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. No; I refuse to yield. I am sorry. Here you have a Germany that has spent from forty to one hundred billion dollars in 7 years, and they are very efficient, and you think by passing a bill of \$182,000,000 that you are prepared. It would take 10 years at \$10,000,000,000 a year to arrive at the point at which the Germans have arrived today. [Applause.] I hate to have to say this, but that has been my training, and you expect at least the truth from me.

Our whole strategy in the Atlantic is at stake in this present war in Europe. If the British Navy falls, here is what we are faced with—a complete revamping of our strategy and the bringing of the fleet into the Atlantic, which means the sacrificing of the whole Pacific structure of our national defense; and while I do not think that Hitler is going to come over here, down to the district of my friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DARDEN] and say, "We would like to take over Hampton Roads"; still, he is looking for lebensraum, and where is he going to get it? In Africa or Asia or perhaps China? Oh, no; he is going to get it in South America. The Monroe Doctrine apparently does not mean much these days, and it will not mean anything unless we are prepared to defend it. [Applause.] I know the President is better informed than I am or most of us. He has 700 men reporting to him every day from all parts of the earth, and I believe he is sincere in going about this in a scientific manner; but he is afraid to tell the people the real gravity of the situation, because from all sides comes the cry, "warmonger." I appeal to you, my friends, to strike out this amendment on civil service, get down to brass tacks, and be in a position to defend the country, if it is worth anything to you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I, of course, recognize the sincerity of my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] but he is overlooking the fact that in the World War the civil-service regulations were not suspended, and in 1 fiscal year, 1 year of 12 months, we employed for the military service in civilian capacities 220,000 people through the civil service. We fought a successful war, we fought that war without any scandals attached to it. It was fought under the Democratic Party, and we cannot afford as a party to have the stigma of partisan politics implanted in our action in regard to national defense and we must not permit it, my friends.

The President of the United States wants this specific provision in here. The Secretary of War wants it in here. Who is asking to take it out? The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], who has always been opposed to civil service and who cannot even think or talk rationally in regard to the civil service. I do not apply that to my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC]. He just does not know about the civilian end. He was in the military end of the last war, and I know he did a good job there, but the President has already issued an Executive order, and it has been in effect

for weeks, giving the War Department and the Navy Department the right to select any necessary employees without regard to the civil service in national-defense matters. I put it in the RECORD on Wednesday. You will find it on page 3155 of the Appendix of the RECORD, where I inserted the letter from the Civil Service Commission and a copy of the Executive order already taking care of this situation.

I appeal to my friends on the Democratic side not to put the stigma of partisan politics into national defense. [Applause.]

(The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.)

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 3 words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I consider it alarming that Congress is doing nothing to meet the pressing need on the financial side of the preparedness program. Certainly our first line of national defense is the wherewithal to purchase the sinews of war. Assuredly no one can possibly question that the soundness of our financial structure is basic. The strength of the needed improvement in our military arm depends primarily upon the strength of our financial structure.

There is not an informed person but who knows the state of our national finances is in a deplorable condition, so much so that it is impossible for it to support the needed defense measures. Undoubtedly appropriations already exceed the legal debt limit of \$45,000,000,000, to say nothing of billions which should properly be charged to the Federal debt but which are not. Now we are adding more than a billion in appropriations for defense. On top of this, consider the startling fact that the working-fund balance of the Treasury will be depleted July 1, 1940, the beginning of the next fiscal year, when average daily expenses will be more than \$27,000,000.

Perhaps this is the first time this has occurred in the history of our country. I am not certain about that, but as far as I can tell, that is the fact. I ask any gentleman on this side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle to rise and say that the working-fund balance of the Federal Treasury on the 1st day of July 1940 will not be depleted. [After a pause.] No one rises to accept that challenge. Now, that is a most serious condition. It is one that is not generally known by the people of this country, but I repeat, we cannot build the national defense which we need so much at this time on a financial structure of that kind. [Applause.] Think of the United States Treasury, under these conditions, being unable to carry over any checking balance from this to next year. Yet the Congress does nothing about these things. We give no consideration whatever to whether the appropriations exceed the legal debt limit or not. We pay no more attention to where the money is to come from for these expenditures than if we were citizens of another nation. An empty Treasury apparently has no meaning whatever to the Congress.

Almost anyone should be able to see this is a dangerous situation. The cause of the unconcern about this grave situation is not hard to find. The conduct of Congress and this administration is governed too much by political considerations, and too little by patriotic ones. This is the ugly truth of the whole matter.

The duty of Congress in this critical hour is plain. We should take immediate steps to abolish several hundred thousand useless and injurious political jobs, eliminate a multitude of boards and bureaus, stop the criminal waste of money that is now taking place, cut Government costs to the very bone. The money that could be saved by this process alone would go far, if not all the way, toward paying for our added defense needs. Whoever opposes this, in my opinion, opposes adequate national defense.

Then, if any additional funds are required, Congress should take a straightforward, upright position on raising them by taxes.

I am sure if the Congress follows this procedure the people will support it 100 percent.

Only by pursuing this course can the American people hope to achieve even the beginning of adequate national defense, which everyone knows is urgently needed. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 3, line 13, strike out "Emergency fund for the President" and all of section 2, beginning in line 14, and insert:

"Sec. 2. Congress shall remain in continuous session when the Nation is in danger of becoming engaged in war, so that Congress can act immediately in any eventuality."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky reserves a point of order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment speaks for itself. The American people demand it. You were elected for it. Will you do your duty or will you turn over your responsibilities to another? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky insist on the point of order?

Mr. MAY. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I had intended to offer has been covered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HAWKS].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: Page 4, line 9, at the end of section 2, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 3. Whenever the President determines that it is necessary in the interest of national defense to prohibit or curtail the exportation of any military equipment or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or material necessary for the manufacture or servicing thereof, he may by proclamation prohibit or curtail such exportation, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. Any such proclamation shall describe the articles or materials included in the prohibition or curtailment contained therein. In case of the violation of any provision of any proclamation, or of any rule or regulation, issued hereunder, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment. The authority granted in this section shall terminate June 30, 1942, unless the Congress shall otherwise provide."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. MAY. As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, it complies with the main conditions set out in a bill that has been reported by the House Military Affairs Committee on the subject of conservation of our war materials in this country. So far as I am concerned, as chairman of the committee I will be glad to accept the amendment because it will save time in the consideration of the other bill.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I feel I should explain the amendment, nevertheless, for the amendment goes a little further than the bill licensing the export of scrap iron and strategic materials which has been reported by the committee.

This section was prepared in the planning branch of the War Department and applies also to munitions, machinery, and tools necessary for the production of munitions for our own use. I understand there have been some recent instances of the exportation of equipment to go into planes, for example, of which we are not able to produce enough for our own military needs.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. The gentleman's amendment applies, however, to scrap iron, copper, and that sort of thing?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. It will apply to any of the materials necessary to our own defense.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut will be agreed to. There was no objection.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWERS: Page 4, line 9, after the period, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 4. In order to effectuate plans for a more adequate national defense the President shall appoint an Authority to Expedite National Defense to consist of five industrial executives to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No more than three members of the Authority shall be of the same political party. The members of the Authority shall be paid a salary not in excess of \$10,000 a year.

"Such Board shall advise and assist the President (1) in the mobilization of the economic and industrial resources of the country for the purpose of national defense, and (2) in preparing and executing plans for the speeding up of production and manufacturing of military equipment, munitions, and other supplies necessary for an adequate national defense."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, may I have an understanding with the gentleman from Kentucky that the amendment which has just been offered by the gentleman from New Jersey is not an amendment to this section but is a new section and, therefore, the agreement that we made as to time does not apply?

Mr. MAY. I understood that we were still within the 40 minutes and that the gentleman from New Jersey was offering it within that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the 40 minutes has expired and that an additional section, section 3, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut was adopted by the committee.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot today about being Americans and forgetting party affiliations in this crisis. My friends on the other side, especially those who know me well, realize that I do not mix partisan politics with national-defense measures.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered creates an Authority to expedite national defense. I have suggested that five industrial executives be appointed to that Authority. There is absolutely no politics in this, and I want the Members on the other side of the aisle to vote for this amendment in spite of me, and not because of me. I want them to vote for this amendment because the President of the United States will have the authority and will be able to bring into Washington five of the leading industrialists of the United States to consult with and to expedite this whole national-defense program.

Mr. Chairman, this is a job of industrial mobilization, this is a job for industrialists, it is not a job for the professional soldier; neither is it a job for some of the present bureau heads. I am asking the membership to adopt this amendment in the name of national defense.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman modify his amendment to read "\$1 a year"? We shall not need to offer a salary of \$10,000 a year.

Mr. POWERS. The amendment calls for a salary not in excess of \$10,000 a year. We could very easily get five \$1-a-year industrial executives.

Mr. DONDERO. They will serve for \$1 a year.

Mr. POWERS. They most assuredly will.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I call for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWERS) there were—ayes 97, noes 149.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. POWERS to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported there were—ayes 128, noes 149.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS of Ohio: After section 3, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 4. The expenditures authorized by section 2 shall be made with the approval and consent of the Authority."

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, in view of the action taken just now by the Committee in refusing to have anybody except politicians and soldiers conduct the industrial activity of the country, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, which was based upon the Committee adopting the Powers amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in an amendment adopted a few minutes ago we provided that the Communists and the Fascists should not be allowed to be paid any of this money that is going to be spent, but I notice that we left out the word "Nazis." The Nazis are in on it, but the Communists and Fascists are out. I do not think the amendment was properly drafted. I believe it will be either stricken out by the Senate or drafted in language which is in accordance with that in appropriation bills passed formerly; but in order to keep the record straight, I ask unanimous consent to return to that amendment and to insert the word "Nazis."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. BOEHNE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill, H. R. 9850, to expedite the strengthening of the national defense, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called civil-service amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], demands a separate vote.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 18, after the word "personnel" strike out the following language: "without regard to Civil Service requirements and restrictions of law relating thereto."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.
Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FADDIS), there were—ayes 197, noes 102.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yas 392, nays 1, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—392

Alexander	Corbett	Graham	Lewis, Ohio
Allen, Ill.	Costello	Grant, Ala.	Luce
Allen, La.	Courtney	Grant, Ind.	Ludlow
Allen, Pa.	Cox	Gregory	Lynch
Andersen, H. Carl	Cravens	Griffith	McAndrews
Anderson, Calif.	Crawford	Gross	McArdle
Anderson, Mo.	Creal	Guyer, Kans.	McCormack
Andresen, A. H.	Crosser	Gwynne	McGehee
Andrews	Crowe	Hall, Edwin A.	McGranery
Angell	Crowther	Hall, Leonard W.	McGregor
Arends	Cullen	Hancock	McKeough
Arnold	Cummings	Harrington	McLaughlin
Austin	Curtis	Hart	McLean
Ball	D'Alesandro	Harter, N. Y.	McLeod
Barnes	Darden, Va.	Harter, Ohio	McMillan, Clara G.
Barry	Davis	Hartley	McMillan, John L.
Barton, N. Y.	Delaney	Havenner	Maas
Bates, Ky.	Dempsey	Hawks	Maciejewski
Bates, Mass.	DeRouen	Healey	Magnuson
Beam	Dickstein	Hendricks	Mahon
Beckworth	Dies	Hennings	Maloney
Bell	Dingell	Hess	Marshall
Bender	Dirksen	Hill	Martin, Ill.
Blackney	Disney	Hinshaw	Martin, Iowa
Bland	Ditter	Hoffman	Mason
Bloom	Dondero	Holmes	Massingale
Boehne	Douglas	Hook	May
Boland	Doxey	Hope	Michener
Bolles	Drewry	Horton	Miller
Bolton	Duncan	Houston	Mills, Ark.
Boren	Dunn	Hull	Mills, La.
Boykin	Durham	Hunter	Monkiewicz
Bradley, Mich.	Dworshak	Izac	Monroney
Bradley, Pa.	Eaton	Jacobsen	Moser
Brewster	Eberhart	Jeffries	Mott
Brooks	Edelstein	Jenkins, Ohio	Mouton
Brown, Ga.	Edmiston	Jenks, N. H.	Mundt
Brown, Ohio	Elliott	Jennings	Murdock, Ariz.
Bryson	Ellis	Jensen	Murdock, Utah
Buck	Elston	Johns	Murray
Buckley, Minn.	Engel	Johnson, Ill.	Myers
Buckley, N. Y.	Englebright	Johnson, Luther A.	Nelson
Bulwinkle	Evans	Johnson, Lyndon	Nichols
Burch	Faddis	Johnson, Okla.	Norrell
Burdick	Fay	Johnson, W. Va.	Norton
Burgin	Fenton	Jones, Ohio	O'Brien
Byrne, N. Y.	Ferguson	Jones, Tex.	O'Connor
Byrns, Tenn.	Fernandez	Jonkman	O'Day
Byron	Fish	Kean	O'Leary
Caldwell	Fitzpatrick	Keefe	Oliver
Camp	Flaherty	Kefauver	O'Neal
Cannon, Fla.	Flannagan	Keller	Osmers
Cannon, Mo.	Flannery	Kelly	O'Toole
Carlson	Folger	Kennedy, Martin	Pace
Carter	Ford, Leland M.	Kennedy, Md.	Parsons
Cartwright	Ford, Miss.	Kennedy, Michael	Patman
Case, S. Dak.	Ford, Thomas F.	Keogh	Patrick
Casey, Mass.	Fries	Kilburn	Patton
Celler	Fulmer	Kinzer	Pearson
Chipperfield	Gamble	Kirwan	Peterson, Fla.
Church	Garrett	Kitchens	Peterson, Ga.
Clark	Gartner	Kleberg	Pfeifer
Clason	Gathings	Knutson	Pierce
Claypool	Gavagan	Kociakowski	Pittenger
Clevenger	Gearhart	Kramer	Poage
Cluett	Gehrman	Kunkel	Polk
Cochran	Gerlach	Lambertson	Powers
Coffee, Nebr.	Geyer, Calif.	Landis	Rabaut
Coffee, Wash.	Gibbs	Lanham	Ramspeck
Cole, Md.	Gifford	Larrabee	Randolph
Cole, N. Y.	Gilchrist	Lea	Rankin
Collins	Gillie	Leavy	Rayburn
Colmer	Goodwin	LeCompte	Reece, Tenn.
Connery	Gore	Lesinski	Reed, Ill.
Cooper	Gossett	Lewis, Colo.	Reed, N. Y.

Rees, Kans.
Rich
Richards
Robertson
Robinson, Utah
Robison, Ky.
Rockefeller
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Okla.
Romjue
Routzohn
Rutherford
Ryan
Sabath
Sacks
Sandager
Sasser
Satterfield
Schafer, Ill.
Schafer, Wis.
Schiffler
Schuetz

Schulte
Schwert
Scrugham
Secombe
Secrest
Seger
Shanley
Sheppard
Sheridan
Short
Simpson
Smith, Conn.
Smith, Ill.
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Smith, W. Va.
Snyder
Somers, N. Y.
South
Sparkman
Spence
Springer
Steagall

Stearns, N. H.
Stefan
Sullivan
Sumner, Ill.
Sutphin
Sweet
Taber
Talle
Tarver
Tenerowicz
Terry
Thill
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tinkham
Tolan
Treadway
Van Zandt
Vincent, Ky.
Vinson, Ga.
Voorhis, Calif.
Vorys, Ohio

Vreeland
Wadsworth
Wallgren
Walter
Ward
Warren
Weaver
Welch
West
Wheat
Whelchel
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams, Del.
Williams, Mo.
Winter
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodruff, Mich.
Woodrum, Va.
Youngdahl
Zimmerman

NAYS—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—37

Barden, N. C.
Chapman
Cooley
Culkin
Darrow
Doughton
Green
Hallock
Hare
Harness

Hobbs
Jarman
Jarrett
Johnson, Ind.
Kee
Kerr
Kilday
Lemke
McDowell
Mansfield

Martin, Mass.
Merritt
Mitchell
Plumley
Risk
Shafer, Mich.
Shannon
Smith, Wash.
Starnes, Ala.
Sumners, Tex.

Sweeney
Taylor
Thorkelson
Tibbott
White, Idaho
White, Ohio
Wood

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Hallack.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Barden of North Carolina with Mr. Tibbott.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. McDowell.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. White of Ohio.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Darrow.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Risk.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Thorkelson.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Green with Mr. Chapman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. SYNDER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8668) making appropriations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. CHAPMAN, was called away today on official business. He asked me to state for the RECORD that had he been present he would have voted "yea" on the bill just passed.

AMENDMENT OF JUDICIAL CODE

Mr. WALTER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7737) to amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section thereto, designated as section 266a, to provide for intervention by States in certain cases involving the validity of the exercise of any power by the United States, or any agency thereof, or any officer or employee thereof, and for other purposes.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the Governor of Louisiana to a graduating cadet corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7405 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Messrs. HOBBS, STARNES, and JARMAN, are absent in the State of Alabama on important business. Had they been present they would each have voted "yea" on the bill that has just been passed.

ARMY MANEUVERS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of attending the Army maneuvers in the State of Louisiana. I went there accompanied by my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. J. BUELL SNYDER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations of the House, and my friend and colleague from South Dakota, Mr. FRANCIS CASE, a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House. While there we had the opportunity of seeing from both the air and the ground the maneuvers, the largest yet undertaken by the Army.

Mr. Speaker, while we were in Louisiana there appeared a press comment of particular importance in reference to that trip and the maneuvers. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD by including this press comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

SNYDER SAYS UNITED STATES SHOULD BE PREPARED—SOUTH DAKOTA, LOUISIANA SOLDIERS ARE VISITING MANEUVERS

CAMP BEAUREGARD, LA., May 13.—Chairman SNYDER (Democrat, Pennsylvania) of the House Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, terming Adolf Hitler a "mania man," said today America was capable of defending itself against attack by a single major power but would need 3 years to prepare for a combined assault on this country.

He said Congress should appropriate \$800,000,000 to raise the peacetime Army to 280,000 men and to provide for other critical items needed in the next 18 months.

SNYDER, visiting the Third Army's maneuvers here with committee member CASE (Republican, South Dakota) and Representative BROOKS (Democrat, Louisiana), member of the Military Affairs Committee, suggested a 3-year program to train 50,000 airplane pilots, mechanics, and technicians.

EXPRESSES FEAR FOR CANADA

He declared Germany already had many "wolves in sheep's clothing" in South America and Mexico, and would make a concerted effort to take over South America in the event of victory over Britain and France. He expressed apprehension also over a combined German-Russian attack on Canada from both sides.

He said, in an interview, that the Nation's anti-aircraft defenses should be doubled immediately; there should be a huge addition to the 5,500 bombing and pursuit ships the Air Corps will have in another year and a half, and America's potential airplane capacity should be 24,000 a month.

"You can't make peace with men like Hitler," he said before beginning a tour of the western Louisiana "battlefield" where 70,000 regulars were moving into position for tomorrow's mimic war, the second phase of the games.

"They jump on the fellow who is least prepared. I call Hitler the mania man."

SEES DUAL MOVE

Explaining his reasons for urging huge defense measures, SNYDER said:

"I think if Germany should win this war she would make a concerted effort to take over South America. I think they already have many wolves in sheep's clothing in South America and Mexico.

"If (after German victory in the European war) Hitler and Stalin, by any chance, should continue their present friendly relationship, we should have to turn our attention to Canada. Stalin would move from the west and Hitler from the east.

"The Western Hemisphere becomes a serious proposition if Germany wins. The cheapest insurance we can carry is to have adequate materials for defense."

MINTON DOESN'T KNOW

"But one thing I want to make plain. I don't want to take our troops off the Western Hemisphere at any time."

Commenting on a statement by Senator MINTON (Democrat, Indiana) that a 13,000-mile tour of military posts had convinced him that "we do not have an Army or the equipment to fit one if we had one," SNYDER said:

"I don't think Senator MINTON knew the full details of the Army when he made that statement. I've been on every Army installation. If MINTON had known all the facts he wouldn't have made that statement."

SNYDER said he considered the present American Army the best in the world for its size, with "planes as good as anybody's."

In explaining his suggestion for a 3-year program to train 50,000 pilots, mechanics, and technicians, he said:

"Training should be for 3 years for men between 18 and 27 years of age. At the end of that time, if we should leave off the program, they would be equipped and trained for civil life.

TAKING 50,000 OUT OF 3,000,000

"The average cost of a W. P. A. boy is \$52.50 monthly. The cost of an Army enlisted man is \$42.50. So the cost of training those 50,000 men in aviation would be less than training W. P. A. boys who would have no benefit at the end of 3 years except knowing how to dig ditches.

"Within the next 6 weeks 1,200,000 boys will be graduated from various schools. Six months from now only half of them will have found jobs.

"Adding them to others already out of jobs, the program I suggest would merely mean taking 50,000 boys out of 3,000,000."

The committee arrived here in midafternoon and toured the camp of the "Blue" armies, defending the territory east of the Sabine River from the invading "Reds." The Representatives will visit the "Reds" tomorrow.

All day soldiers of the Third Army were moving into position for tomorrow's maneuvers which will pick up where they left off Saturday after 3 days of active movement through woods and hills.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an oration by Miss Florence Hammons on My Obligation as a Citizen Under the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein excerpts from a message of the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is absent on account of the death of his mother. I am authorized to say that if he were here he would have voted for the bill just passed.

MILITARY TRAINING FOR C. C. C. ENROLLEES

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 years I have consistently and repeatedly advocated military training for enrollees of all C. C. C. camps of the country. But a lot of so-called pacifists and radical pacifists' organizations have been loud in opposition to such a proposal.

It has been my privilege to visit more than 50 C. C. C. camps in some 15 States of this Union. I have asked the enrollees wherever I went if they would like the opportunity of taking military training and I am delighted to say that at least 95 percent of the enrollees in the various camps have enthusiastically approved the suggestion. I personally know that a large number of these fine young men feel that this great Government should extend to them that privilege. Had this been done at the outset of this great program, that has done so much for the needy youth of America, we would now have an army of nearly 3,000,000 young men trained for any emergency.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say that I have also introduced a measure along similar lines. I believe this is a highly important step that should be taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman and will say I agree with him wholeheartedly that this should be done and that immediately. Too long have we delayed this matter. Too long have we listened to the so-called "sob sisters," some of whom are active in "fifth column" activities. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a tribute on the life and character of Mrs. Nettie Coryelle, who has been home demonstration agent for Grady County, Okla., for more than a quarter of a century.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL AVIATION FORUM

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by Thomas H. Beck.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the National Aviation Forum, which is to be held in this city on the coming Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week, under the auspices of the National Aviation Association.

This forum will give Members of Congress and the public an opportunity to see late improvements in airplanes and aeronautical instruments and appliances. Moreover, many prominent figures in aviation will speak at the various sessions of the forum to be held Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, May 27, 28, and 29. I quote from those in charge of the program:

"The question of national defense, especially in the air, has been raised in Washington this week as never before," Thomas H. Beck, general chairman, pointed out today. "This National Aviation Forum of 1940 and its Aeronautical Exhibition at Bolling Field will provide a good part of the answer."

More than 125 manufacturers will exhibit at Bolling Field from 3 p. m. to 6 p. m. on Sunday and from 3 p. m. to 11 p. m. on the 3 following days.

From Monday through Wednesday, the most prominent of this Nation's aviation leaders will speak at forum sessions in the Department of Commerce auditorium. Two of the outstanding addresses will be made by Mayor F. H. LaGuardia, of New York, who has promised to let go full blast on the subject "Let's Tell the Truth," and Al Williams, who will speak at the banquet on the subject "Real Air Power for the United States."

The 4-day program has been outlined as follows:

Sunday, May 26: Model exhibition day.

Monday, May 27: Private flyers' day.

Tuesday, May 28: Air-line day.

Wednesday, May 29: National-defense day.

THE NATIONAL AVIATION FORUM OF 1940

(By Thomas H. Beck, general chairman)

During the week of May 26 thousands of residents and visitors in Washington, D. C., will witness a spectacular demonstration of

this Nation's aeronautical strength and potentialities, civilian and military.

The occasion is the National Aviation Forum of 1940 and its complementary aeronautical exhibition at nearby Bolling Field.

With civilian air travel constantly reaching new peaks, and with questions regarding the true air strength of the Nation inevitably in mind at this time, this year's forum, under the auspices of the National Aeronautical Association, is bound to be of interest to every American. Nor is it confined to those of us of the North Americas, for President Roosevelt has instructed the State Department to invite representatives of 21 nations of the Western Hemisphere.

"I know of no way better to promote the best technical development of aviation than through meetings such as that which is to take place in May," President Roosevelt wrote. "I need hardly say that in the interest of all the Americas such development is essential."

While the forum in the Department of Commerce auditorium will consist of talks by leading aviation figures, emphasis this year is being placed upon getting home to the entire public of the Americas the story of where this Nation stands and where it is going in the ever-widening field of aeronautics.

The Aeronautical Exhibition at Bolling Field, therefore, will be the public's own show. Two tremendous hangars will contain exhibits by the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Weather Bureau, Post Office Department, Work Projects Administration, Office of Education, Air Transport Association, National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, and Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The manufacturers of airplanes and accessories will be represented in full force and the public will see everything, from the huge stratosphere planes to the most delicate of precision instruments.

More than 300 private flyers from coast to coast will converge on Washington during the week. Then there will be formation flying by Navy and commercial blimps and flights to and from Washington by the latest aircraft developed for commercial flying.

In the Department of Labor auditorium free motion pictures will show the progress of flying from the days of the fabled "Icarus" to present-day flying fortresses.

American aviation has a story of profound significance to tell at this National Aviation Forum of 1940.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the Honorable Joseph W. Davis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] be given permission to extend his remarks and to include therein a radio address that he delivered last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that our colleagues the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, and the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. PLUMLEY, are absent today on official business. Had they been here they would have voted in favor of the bill just passed.

FILING MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority Members may have permission to file minority views on the bill H. R. 9450 and that they be printed with the majority report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues Messrs. HAL-LECK, HARNES, and JOHNSON of Indiana, are detained in Indiana on important business. Had they been present today they would each have voted "yea" on the bill which has just been passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made today certain tables with respect to War Department appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Montana, Mr. THORKELSON, was unavoidably absent today. Had he been present he would have voted "yea" on the bill just passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the extension of my remarks made in Committee of the Whole today, I may include certain excerpts and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Messrs. TIBBOTT, DARROW, GARRETT, and McDOWELL were unavoidably detained this afternoon. Had they been present they would have voted "yea" on the bill just passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I made this afternoon I may include part of Washington's Farewell Address and also an article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ARMY SCHOOL OF NURSING

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I do this to call the attention of the House to the matter of preparation for the care of any additions to the Army and the successful care of the civilian population should we have any sort of need for an increased nursing service. During the last war there was created an Army school of nursing, and I call attention to the extension which I shall put in the RECORD, which will give some idea of what might well be done at this time. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a speech that I delivered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests to make. First, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith an editorial, and, second, that on Wednesday next at the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's desk and any special orders heretofore made, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next at 8 p. m. it may be in order to call bills on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to ask the gentleman to modify his request to say bills reported from the Committee on Claims only.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make that modification.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I wonder if the majority leader is in a position to tell us the program for next week.

Mr. RAYBURN. For at least 3 days definitely. On Monday the resolution returning the Townsend silver bill will be under consideration. Following that a resolution confirming the last reorganization order of the President. After that the Committee on the District of Columbia has one bill. After that it is the intention to take up the conference report on the bill providing for the civil functions of the Military Establishment. On Tuesday we will consider the so-called Vinson bill, and on Wednesday take up the conference report upon the Interior Department appropriation bill. For the remainder of the week on Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, there will appear on the program a conference report on the Home Owners' Loan Bank bill, and we will consider the Smith amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is the gentleman in the position to indicate when the Smith amendments to the labor-relations bill will be reached? We have had the understanding time and time again that that matter will be called up. The last we heard was that it would probably be taken up on Tuesday next. It appears to be pushed back further in order that matters of less importance may have the right-of-way. Those advocating the adoption of that measure are entitled to consideration and we want consideration and we put the House on notice that we will do everything within our power to get it without any considerable further delay.

Mr. RAYBURN. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia that he sat in a conference in which we arranged for the priority of rules.

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. And about the seventh on the list was the Home Owners' Loan Bank bill.

Mr. COX. Yes; but a lot of "chicken feed" has been crowded in to push that bill further back.

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, the gentleman cannot accuse me of that, because I do not think he thinks conference reports and bills like the one we had up today and which we intend to take up on Tuesday and the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill may be classed as "chicken feed." Those bills have to pass.

Mr. COX. Of course, I would not even suspect my friend of bad faith; but he probably does not appreciate the importance of quick action as I and others who are intensely interested in the adoption of that measure.

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to say to the gentleman that another bill in which there was great interest was the wage and hour bill, and it took 7 days, and it was futile.

Mr. COX. Yes; and it was tragic that it met with the fate which it did meet.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas with reference to the session on Wednesday evening?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, to ask the majority leader further when it may be expected that the Federal highway bill will be considered. That is a very important bill and must be considered at this session of the Congress in order that about 38 State legislatures may pass enabling legislation at their sessions which convene in January.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will say to the gentleman that that is about the thirteenth rule that I have in my lap now. The same question is being asked me about all of the others. I certainly think that is a necessary bill and should be considered by the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the gentleman's intention that we may look forward to adjourning from the 8th to the 15th, as stated by the press today?

Mr. RAYBURN. I am always a little careful about making positive statements or predictions about adjournment, because usually it takes about 10 days to adjourn after you get ready. I think that we can, in all probability, close this session by the 15th of the month.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. DITTER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the majority leader will tell us as to whether any consideration would be given to Memorial Day, insofar as it is possible to do so?

Mr. RAYBURN. It would be very fortunate, I think, if general debate might happen on some bill that day, but I want to say candidly to the gentleman if these measures of national defense are ready, they will take priority.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—

Mr. DITTER. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order that I may ask further questions with reference to the unanimous-consent request that the gentleman from Texas has propounded to the Chair. Since the majority leader has given us a general survey of the program of the majority, looking toward possible adjournment, does that include any time at all for the consideration of a tax measure?

Mr. RAYBURN. Not up to now.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I do so simply to ask the majority leader this question: There will be no other bills taken up for consideration next week other than those he has outlined?

Mr. RAYBURN. Two appropriation bills—the Army appropriation bill, to which a great many amendments have been added, and the naval appropriation bill, to which a great many amendments have been added—are going to lie on the Speaker's desk until the subcommittees have had a reasonable time to consider them. If they should come in and there should be insistence, I think they should take priority.

Mr. BEAM. I appreciate that fact; but what I am particularly interested in is the fact that the Mexican claims bill was scheduled to come up on Monday.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think the Mexican claims bill, with the four other matters coming up, in all probability will not be reached on Monday.

Mr. BEAM. And it will go over until the following week?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I do not know whether it will or not.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to say frankly that I am not satisfied with the

understanding we have had with reference to the consideration of the Smith bill. I would like to inquire of the majority leader if he expects to make it possible for the House to consider that bill during the coming week. We are entitled to a better understanding. We are entitled to better treatment than we are getting. I say that without any intention of giving offense, but out of an appreciation of the importance of consideration of that question.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman address his request?

Mr. COX. I address my request to the majority leader. Is he in position to say that we can have consideration of the Smith amendments during the coming week?

Mr. RAYBURN. The Rules Committee granted, as I understand, either 2 or 4 hours general debate on an amendment to the home owners' loan bill.

Mr. COX. Last year?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; that is right. We have not had time to reach that yet.

Mr. COX. It is not a question of time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, yes.

Mr. COX. It is not a question of time, Mr. Speaker. The opportune moment just has not arrived for that bill to be taken up.

Mr. RAYBURN. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. COX. I mean that the opportune moment to take that bill up has not arrived.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan demands the regular order. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 255. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the port of Cascade Locks, Oreg., certain lands for municipal purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 27, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WAR CLAIMS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on War Claims on Monday, May 27, 1940, at 10 a. m., in the committee room—228 House Office Building—for a hearing on S. 3097, for the relief of Katherine M. Drier.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be held before subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary a hearing on H. R. 8963, to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act (to include chiropractic practitioners). The hearing will be held at 10 a. m. Monday, May 27, 1940, in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, room 247, House Office Building, Tuesday, May 28, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of considering H. R. 9149, entitled "A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled 'An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian Wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes.'"

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will meet on Monday, May 27, 1940, at 10 a. m., in room 128, House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 9877.

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining that was appointed to consider S. 2420 will continue hearings on Tuesday, May 28, and Friday, May 31, 1940, at 10 a. m., in the committee rooms in the New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs on Wednesday, May 29, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 3402 and H. R. 6583, and hearings on H. R. 9301 at 11 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Wednesday, May 29, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of private bills now pending before the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1675. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, Architect of the Capitol, for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941, amounting to \$348,326 (H. Doc. No. 786); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1676. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Fisheries, for the fiscal year 1941, amounting to \$107,500, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 787); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1677. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the acquisition of additional land for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1678. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1941, amounting to \$145,584 (H. Doc. No. 785); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. Minority report (pt. II) on H. R. 9450. A bill transferring the active list of the Construction Corps to the line of the Navy, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 500. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Mrs. Albert Rapee (Rept. No. 2275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 5944. A bill to carry out certain obligations to certain enrolled Indians under tribal agreement; with amendment (Rept. No. 2276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 7738. A bill to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 2277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 8124. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with public-school districts (organized and unorganized) in Mahanomen, Itasca, Pine, St. Louis, Clearwater, Koochiching,

and Becker Counties, Minn., in the construction, improvement, and extension of school facilities to be available to both Indian and white children; with amendment (Rept. No. 2278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 8815. A bill to grant per diem compensation to the appointed members of the Board of Steam and Other Operating Engineers of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNYDER: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 8668. A bill regarding civil functions administration by the War Department (Rept. No. 2307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 7737. A bill to amend the Judicial Code (Rept. No. 2308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3713. A bill for the relief of Joe Carter; with amendment (Rept. No. 2280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3925. A bill for the relief of Evelyn L. Ratcliffe; with amendment (Rept. No. 2281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4148. A bill for the relief of Mary S. Arthur, as executrix of the estate of Richard M. Arthur, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 2282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4412. A bill for the relief of Beatrice Lois Rucker; with amendment (Rept. No. 2283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5388. A bill for the relief of Thomas Lewellyn and Drusilla Lewellyn; with amendment (Rept. No. 2284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FENTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5569. A bill for the relief of Stuart Bastow; with amendment (Rept. No. 2285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6730. A bill for the relief of Edward P. Glenn, Jr., with amendment (Rept. No. 2286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6737. A bill for the relief of Clarence D. Green; with amendment (Rept. No. 2287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6889. A bill for the relief of Frances M. Hannah; with amendment (Rept. No. 2288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7098. A bill for the relief of L. S. Jones; with amendment (Rept. No. 2289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7490. A bill for the relief of Florence Conjard; with amendment (Rept. No. 2290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7852. A bill for the relief of Edward Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 2291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7856. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Mackenroth; without amendment (Rept. No. 2292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8252. A bill for the relief of John Owen; with amendment (Rept. No. 2293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8414. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Molster, former disbursing clerk for the Department of Commerce and the National Recovery Administration; J. L. Summers, deceased, former chief disbursing clerk, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 2294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8605. A bill for the relief of the estate of Adam Janiec; with amendment (Rept. No. 2295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8708. A bill for the relief of Harold C. Preble, naval architect; without amendment (Rept. No. 2296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 764. An act for the relief of Charles F. Kegel; without amendment (Rept. No. 2297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 881. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugh G. Nicholson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Claims. S. 1024. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher; with amendment (Rept. No. 2299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Claims. S. 2209. An act for the relief of Earle Embrey; without amendment (Rept. No. 2300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 2250. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Tondre; without amendment (Rept. 2301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 3044. An act for the relief of Nadine Sanders; without amendment (Rept. No. 2302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 3061. An act for the relief of Andrew Olson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on Claims. S. 3196. An act to amend the act approved May 24, 1938, entitled "An act for the relief of the Comision Mixta Demarcadora de Limites Entre Colombia y Panama" and for the relief of Jose Antonio Sossa D.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2304). Referred to Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Claims. S. 3306. An act for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former Acting Chief Disbursing Clerk, Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 2305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Claims. S. 3337. An act for the relief of the Lewis State Bank of Tallahassee, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRON:

H. R. 9880. A bill to authorize the transfer of lands from the United States to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission under certain conditions, and to accept title to another tract to be transferred to the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKS:

H. R. 9881. A bill to restrict the use of arms and other implements of war by aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 9882. A bill to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 9883. A bill to amend the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912 (37 Stat. 315), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 9884. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 9885. A bill to provide for military instruction and training for members of the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 9886. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act (June 26, 1934, ch. 750, par. 1, 48 Stat. 1216, sec. 1761); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 9887 (by departmental request). A bill to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 9888. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act (the Motor Carrier Act, 1935), as amended, so as to make certain provisions thereof applicable to freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 9889. A bill authorizing the construction of a new hospital at Jefferson, Ga., to be known as the Crawford W. Long Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 9890. A bill authorizing the establishment of a Coast Guard air station at or in the vicinity of Astoria, Oreg.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 9891. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in establishing and developing programs in adult civic education providing for (a) removal of illiteracy, (b) naturalization education, and (c) public-affairs forums, during a 4-year period; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. CONNERY:

H. R. 9892. A bill to aid the Army and the Navy in more adequately providing for the national defense; to the Committee on Patents.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAWKS:

H. R. 9893. A bill for the relief of Clarence H. Lowell, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 9894. A bill for the relief of Otto Rudolf Nemeth; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. R. 9895. A bill for the relief of Philip V. Sullivan, lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8414. By Mr. HART: Petition of the United Polish Organizations of Camden, N. J., protesting against the excesses committed upon the innocent people of Poland by Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia, and urging our Government to render all possible assistance to unfortunate inhabitants of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8415. By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Wagner Baking Corporation of Newark, N. J., opposing House bill 9273, known as the income certificate plan or the Pierce bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8416. Also, petition of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Locals 1-10, opposing House bill 9766; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8417. Also, petition of the Good and Welfare Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring immediate enactment of the longevity bill, in order to give credit to employees of interrupted service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8418. Also, petition of the New York State Credit Union League, Inc., urging immediate enactment of Senate bill 2568; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8419. Also, petition of the executive council of the International Association of Machinists, with a membership of more than 200,000 skilled workers, expressing its gratitude to the President of the United States for his leadership in the defense program, and vigorously supporting the enlightened program of preparedness he has proposed to the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8420. Also, petition of W. E. McKay & Co., of New York City, relative to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8421. Also, petition of the New York City Central Committee, representing 45,000 members, opposing the sale of war materials to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8422. Also, petition of the Moran Towing & Transportation Co., Inc., supporting the quotas reestablished on sugar from Puerto Rico and Hawaii—these limitations having expired on February 29, 1940; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8423. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Local No. 55, New York City, urging immediate enactment of legislation prohibiting the transfer of funds, credits, or other assistance to the Allied armies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8424. Also, petition of the Theater Arts Committee, New York City, opposing increased appropriation for the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8425. Also, petition of the American Communications Association, Local No. 10, New York City, opposing any involvement of the United States in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8426. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Grace E. White and 178 other citizens of Brown County, Kans., urging consideration of and action on the Townsend bill in this session of Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8427. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of provisional committee to keep United States out of war, representing residents of Forest Hills, Kew Gardens, and neighboring communities in New York City, that the United States shall not take part in the European War, uphold strict neutrality, oppose further sale of war materials to belligerents, and oppose attempt to lend money to them; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8428. Also, resolution of the Metropolitan League of Savings and Loan Associations, New York City, urging the Senators and Representatives to support House bill 6971; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8429. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, approving the President's defense message to Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8430. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of the International Hod Carriers and Building and Common Labor Union of America, Local No. 703, at Champaign and Urbana, Ill., in the interest of the employment of union labor on skilled portions of Work Projects Administration projects; to the Committee on Labor.

8431. Also, petition of the Chauffeurs, Teamsters, and Helpers Local Union No. 798 of Champaign and Urbana, Ill., in the interest of the employment of union labor on skilled portions of Work Projects Administration projects; to the Committee on Labor.

8432. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of E. G. Dingman, village president, New Haven, Mich., and 133 others, favoring the enactment of the Townsend national recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8433. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. J. Carrier, of Bridge-water, Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

8434. Also, petition of Local No. 17, International Woodworkers of America, Astoria, Oreg., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 9195, concerning the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Labor.

8435. Also, petition of the International Union United Automobile Workers of America, Local Union No. 113, Muskegon, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8436. Also, petition of Hudson Local 154, United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8437. Also, petition of Association the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, Memphis, Tenn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 591, United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8438. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the California Lawyers Association, Inc., relative to the approval of the resolution adopted by the State Bar of California pertaining to providing for administrative agencies, etc.; to the Select Committee on Government Reorganization.

8439. By Mr. SPRINGER: Resolution of Indiana State Industrial Union Council, Indianapolis, Ind., pertaining to the use of the Espionage Act and agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by certain employers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 27, 1940

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 24, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O spirit of the living God, whose creative breath is life from the dead and the upspringing of flowers of goodness in the hearts of men: Think, Thou, in us thoughts necessary for our guidance when we are perturbed, thoughts for our quickening when the wings of aspiration fail us, that we may always be alert to the high claims of character as we deliberate concerning the welfare of our country. Clothe our mortal weakness with Thy strength, give to us the constant comfort of Thy calm; and we pray that Thou wilt ever teach us that we're armed without if innocent within. And so we further pray:

Thy kingdom come, O God!
Thy rule, O Christ, begin!
Break with Thine iron rod
The tyrannies of sin.
Where is Thy reign of peace
And purity and love?
When shall all hatred cease
As in the realms above?
When comes the promised time
That war shall be no more,
Oppression, lust, and crime
Shall flee Thy face before?
We pray Thee, Lord, arise
And come in Thy great might,
Revive our longing eyes
Which languish for Thy sight.